

**SEVENTH PROGRESS REPORT ON THE  
COMPENSATED WORK THERAPY (CWT) /  
VETERANS INDUSTRIES (VI) PROGRAM**

**FISCAL YEAR 2003**

**Sandra G. Resnick, Ph.D.  
Associate Director**

**Rick Baldino  
Program Analyst**

**Linda Corwel  
Program Analyst**

**Sharon Medak  
Associate Project Director**

**Robert Rosenheck, MD  
Director**

**Department of Veterans Affairs  
Northeast Program Evaluation Center (182)  
VA Connecticut Healthcare System  
West Haven, CT 06516  
(203) 937-3850**

**VA intranet: [vaww.nepec.mentalhealth.med.va.gov](http://vaww.nepec.mentalhealth.med.va.gov)**



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program is a therapeutic work-for-pay program authorized in 1976 by Public Law 94-581. The major goals of the program are: 1) to use remunerative work to maximize a veteran's level of functioning; 2) to prepare veterans for successful re-entry into the community as productive citizens, and; 3) to provide a structured daily activity to those veterans with severe and chronic disabling physical and/or mental conditions. The program has grown substantially over the years from 76 programs in FY 1994 to 105 programs in FY 2003. During FY 2003, 13,751 veterans participated in the program, earning a total of \$35.6 million dollars.

This report, the seventh in a series, offers information for program managers at the national level, VISN level and the local program level.

During FY 2003, veterans entering the CWT/VI Program averaged 47.4 years of age and 4.5% were female. Half of the veterans were African American (50.4%), 4.7% were Hispanic, 2.3% were of other ethnic backgrounds, and 42.6% were White. Only 8.1% were married; 62.7% were separated, widowed or divorced, and 29.2% had never married. Approximately 93% had completed 12 years of education, and 42% completed at least some college. Although 43.0% of veterans reported that their usual employment pattern in the past three years was full-time competitive employment, nine out of ten veterans (90.8%) reported not working at all in the month prior to admission. Veterans entering the CWT/VI program have limited financial resources. Mean monthly incomes in the month prior to admission have steadily dropped from \$347 in FY 1993 to \$205 in FY 2003. Six out of ten veterans (62.5%) were homeless upon entry to CWT/VI. Substance abuse is highly prevalent in this population – at admission, 86.1% of veterans were diagnosed with either an alcohol problem and/or a drug problem and over half reported to have lost at least one job in the past due to their substance use. The proportion of veterans diagnosed with a serious mental illness or with a dual diagnosis (both a substance abuse disorder and a serious mental illness) is at its highest point since FY 1993: 47.8% of admitted veterans received a diagnosis of a serious mental illness, and 38.9% of veterans were dually diagnosed.

Veterans discharged during FY 2003 worked an average of 26.3 hours per week in CWT/VI and had an average hourly wage of \$5.93. The proportion of veterans who had any Transitional Work Experience while in CWT/VI has more than doubled from FY 1993 (30.1%) to FY 2003 (82.0%). In FY 2003, workshop experiences were less common, with only 31.8% working in a workshop at least once. The majority of placements (both TWE and workshop) are on VA grounds.

Upon completion of their participation, four out of ten veterans had obtained competitive employment (full- or part-time). An additional 4.1% had arrangements at the time of discharge to be in some type of constructive activity (e.g. VA's Incentive Therapy, student, trainee or unpaid volunteer) and 10.8% were retired and/or disabled. Since FY 1993 there has been an increase in the percentage of veterans rated as improved in virtually all clinical areas (e.g. alcohol problems, drug problems, mental health problems and medical problems)

and work performance areas (e.g. attendance and punctuality, acceptance of supervision, relationship with co-workers, productivity and quality of production), although these percentages are relatively unchanged from FY 2002.

Performance as measured by 13 critical monitors was used to compare the operation of individual sites and to identify performance outliers. The norm used to evaluate the performance of individual sites on each critical monitor was either the national program mean, or in the case of outcome measures, the national median. Outcome measures were risk adjusted for differences in baseline veteran characteristics that are related to the outcomes. Nineteen of the 98 programs for which data are presented were outliers on 5 or more of the 12 critical monitors.

Comprehensive workload data summaries for VA's entire Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service (PSR), using data from the outpatient care file in Austin, Texas, indicate that altogether 39,213 individual veterans received PSR services during FY 2003 and 22,848 of them (58.3%) received services from either the CWT/VI or CWT/TR programs.

As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT/VI will be an important element in fostering community adjustment and functional rehabilitation of veterans disabled by psychiatric or addictive disorders, particularly CWT/VI transitional work placements that are community-based.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The monitoring of the Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program is accomplished through the work and cooperation of many people. In VA Central Office, Frederick Lee M.S., Anthony Campinell Ph.D., Mary Jansen Ph.D. and Laurent Lehmann M.D. guide the program. They have provided invaluable leadership and support to both the program and its evaluation. This report was prepared with the unflagging support of staff at the Northeast Program Evaluation Center, especially Bernice Zigler of the programming staff.

We would also like to express our sincere appreciation for the work of the CWT/VI Program Coordinators and all their staff. They are truly a unique and creative group of professionals with a keen sense for both business and clinical care, and who work tirelessly on behalf of veterans with diverse and challenging needs.

Sandra Resnick, Ph.D.  
Rick Baldino  
Linda Corwel  
Sharon Medak  
Robert Rosenheck MD

June 2004  
West Haven, CT



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. The Compensated Work Therapy / Veterans Industries Program .....	1
B. Organization of the Veterans Health Administration .....	1
C. Evaluation and Monitoring Efforts.....	2
1. Data Used to Assess CWT/VI Program Performance .....	2
2. Selection of Critical Monitors .....	3
3. Determining Outliers on Critical Monitors.....	3
4. Overview of the Monitoring Process .....	4
5. CWT/VI as One Component of the Larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service .....	4
D. Organization of This Report.....	5
<b>CHAPTER II THE CLINICAL OPERATION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
A. National Performance .....	7
B. VISN Performance .....	8
C. Site Performance .....	9
1. Compliance with Program Monitoring .....	9
2. Descriptive Program Measures and Critical Monitor Measures .....	10
3. Trend Data on Risk Adjusted Outcome Critical Monitors .....	10
D. CWT/VI as One Component of the Larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service .....	10
E. Summary.....	11
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix A. Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (Third Version) .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix B. CWT/VI Monitoring Data Tables .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix C. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Data Tables.....</b>	<b>125</b>



## **CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION**

### **A. The Compensated Work Therapy / Veterans Industries Program**

The Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program is a therapeutic work-for-pay program in which private sector businesses, or Federal Agencies, contract with VA for work to be performed by veterans. Authorized in 1976 by Public Law 94-581, the major goals of the program are: 1) to use remunerative work to maximize a veteran's level of functioning; 2) to prepare veterans for successful re-entry into the community as productive citizens, and; 3) to provide a structured daily activity to those veterans with severe and chronic disabling physical and/or mental conditions (Fountaine & Howard, 1987).

The CWT/VI Program has grown substantially over the years from 76 programs in FY 1994 to 105 operating programs in FY 2003. During FY 2003, VA Central Office reported that 13,751 veterans had been served in the program and these veterans had earned a total of \$35.6 million dollars through their participation in CWT/VI. As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT/VI continues to be an important element in veterans' overall rehabilitation treatment plan.

VA medical centers sponsoring CWT/VI programs have two basic types of work therapy models. The first and more popular is a transitional employment model called Transitional Work Experiences (TWE). TWE sites are primarily located in government settings, usually the local VA medical center, but may also be located in community businesses. Veterans participating in TWE placements receive direct supervision from the customer or contractor. CWT/VI clinicians visit the placement site regularly and provide additional supervision as needed. The second work therapy model is participation in workshop-based sheltered employment. Work performed in the workshop most often involves assembly, packaging, collating and/or fabrication, although some sites operate workshops in which veterans learn advanced skills such as woodworking. Veterans are either paid on a piece rate basis or receive an hourly wage. Although some CWT/VI program sites operate both work therapy models, recently TWEs have been more popular, probably because they more closely approximate supported employment which is considered to be an evidence-based practice (Bond, Becker, Drake, et al, 2003). Several of the more recently established CWT/VI programs only offer TWE placements without a workshop option.

### **B. Organization of the Veterans Health Administration**

The Veterans Health Administration (VHA) is organized into 22 semi-autonomous Veterans Integrated Service Networks (VISNs)<sup>1</sup>. Each VISN is charged with developing cost-effective health care programs that are responsive both to the national mission of VA, and to local circumstances and trends in health care delivery. Although administered independently, the VISNs are also accountable through centralized monitoring of

---

<sup>1</sup> During FY 2002, VISNs 13 and 14 dissolved and merged into one VISN, VISN 23.

performance and health care outcomes. This report, the seventh in a series of performance reports, offers information for program managers at the national level, VISN level and the local program level.

### **C. Evaluation and Monitoring Efforts**

Since 1993 the Northeast Program Evaluation Center (NEPEC) in West Haven, CT has monitored the CWT/VI Program. The goals of the monitoring are to 1) provide a description of the status and needs of veterans currently in CWT/VI, 2) assure program accountability, and 3) identify ways to refine or change the program, both nationally and/or at specific sites.

Tracking the ongoing performance of CWT/VI program is accomplished through collecting information on every veteran who participates in CWT/VI treatment. The Veteran Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (see Appendix A) is completed on every veteran admitted to the CWT/VI program. Implemented on June 1, 1993 and revised in September, 2000, the form consists of two sections. The first section is completed on or as near to the day of admission to CWT/VI as possible. Based on information obtained in a face-to-face interview with the veteran, the CWT/VI clinician records veteran demographic and military service characteristics as well as residential, vocational and income status. At the end of the first section, clinicians record the avenue of entry into the CWT/VI program and the veteran's psychiatric and medical status. The second section is completed at the conclusion of CWT/VI treatment. The clinician records the veteran's length of participation, type of discharge, total earnings, hours worked, and the veteran's arrangements for employment and housing after discharge. In addition, CWT/VI clinicians record their impressions of clinical change (deteriorated, unchanged or improved) in six work performance areas and four clinical areas.

#### *1. Data Used to Assess CWT/VI Program Performance*

The performance of each CWT/VI program is assessed with three types of measures that reflect essential aspects of program operation:

*The **program monitoring compliance measure*** assesses compliance of individual CWT/VI programs with the collection of monitoring data.

***Descriptive measures*** provide basic information on the characteristics of the veterans served by the program (e.g. age, marital status, race, etc) or what veterans do while in the program (e.g., hours worked, wages earned, etc.).

***Outcome measures*** provide information about veterans' status upon discharge from the program.

Some descriptive and outcome measures are also considered to be ***critical monitor measures***. These measures evaluate how successful programs are at meeting the goals and objectives of the CWT/VI Program as set forth by programmatic guidelines. Critical monitors are used to identify sites whose performance is substantially different from other sites.

## *2. Selection of Critical Monitors*

Outlined below are three objectives that reflect the goals of the CWT/VI Program. For each objective, the associated critical monitors are noted. The critical monitors cover three principal areas: 1) veteran characteristics (the extent to which the CWT/VI Program reaches the seriously mentally ill veteran population); 2) program participation (i.e. type of discharge, hours worked, hourly wage); and 3) outcomes (i.e. employment arrangements at the time of discharge, percent clinically improved).

### **Objective 1: The CWT/VI Program serves veterans with psychological or physical disabilities, particularly the underserved disabled veteran population.**

Critical monitor selected to assess this objective is:

- Percent of veterans with a serious mental illness

### **Objective 2: The CWT/VI Program provides psychosocial (or physical) rehabilitation through remunerative work to veterans in order to encourage the development of good work habits, emphasizing attendance, reliability, punctuality, productivity, craftsmanship, creativity, personal responsibilities and acceptance of supervision.**

Critical monitors selected to assess this objective are:

- Percent of veterans who had a mutually agreed/planned discharge from CWT/VI
- Percent of veterans who failed to comply with CWT/VI program requirements
- Average hours worked per week
- Average hourly wage
- Average work improvement score

### **Objective 3: The CWT/VI Program provides treatment directed towards increasing the veteran's chances for adjustment and reentry into the community, including returning to the workforce and, preventing deterioration of medical, psychiatric and substance abuse problems.**

Critical monitors selected to assess this objective are:

- Among veterans with alcohol problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with drug problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with mental health problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with medical problems, percent improved
- Percent competitively employed (part- or full-time) after discharge
- Percent unemployed after discharge
- Percent employment status unknown after discharge

## *3. Determining Outliers on Critical Monitors*

Generally, the average (or median) of all CWT/VI sites is used as the norm for evaluating the performance of each individual site. On descriptive measures, those sites that are one standard deviation above or below the mean in the *undesirable* direction are considered outliers. Outcome measures are risk adjusted for baseline characteristics. Selection of these baseline characteristics differs depending on the outcome measure, but

they include age, race, marital status, education, previous employment history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses, including serious psychiatric illnesses and substance abuse problems. Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the *undesirable* direction after adjusting for baseline measures are considered outliers.

The identification of a site as an outlier on a critical monitor is intended to inform the program director, medical center leadership, network leadership and VA Central Office that the site is divergent from other sites with respect to the critical monitor. Each site is asked to carefully consider the measures on which they are outliers. In some instances this information is used to take corrective action in order to align the site more closely with the mission and goals of the program. In other instances sites have been identified as outliers because of legitimate idiosyncrasies in the operation of the program, which do not warrant corrective action. **It must be emphasized that these monitors should not be considered, by themselves, to be indicators of the quality of care delivered at particular sites.** They can be used only to identify statistical outliers, the importance of which must be determined by further discussion.

#### *4. Overview of the Monitoring Process*

Forms are completed on each veteran discharged from the CWT/VI program and are submitted monthly to NEPEC by program sites. These data are aggregated and reported back to sites on a quarterly basis. Before this progress report was issued, preliminary tables were distributed to all CWT/VI program sites, and CWT/VI program coordinators and staff were asked to review all tables for errors. VA Central Office has also reviewed data presented in this report. Data have been corrected or amended where appropriate.

#### *5. CWT/VI as one Component of the Larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service*

The CWT/VI Program is only one component of the larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service (PSR), a section of the Mental Health Strategic Health Group. Other programs within PSR include Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence (CWT/TR)<sup>2</sup>, Incentive Therapy (IT)<sup>3</sup> and Vocational Assistance / Counseling.

Data corresponding to 9 stop codes from VA's outpatient care file in Austin Texas were also obtained: 574 (mental health - CWT), 532 (psychosocial rehab-individual; used in the CWT/TR program), 559 (psychosocial rehab-group; used in the CWT/TR program), 208 (rehab medicine – CWT), 573 (Incentive Therapy – group), 207 (rehab medicine – Incentive

---

<sup>2</sup> The CWT/TR program is a work-based Psychosocial Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Program (PR RTP) offering a 24-hour setting for veterans involved in CWT/VI. The program utilizes a residential community, peer and professional support, with a strong emphasis on increasing personal responsibility. Veterans contribute (using their CWT/VI earnings) to the cost of operating and maintaining the residences and are responsible for planning purchasing and preparing their own meals. For more information on the CWT/TR program see the Fifth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program, Seibyl, Sieffert, Medak and Rosenheck, 2002).

<sup>3</sup> Incentive Therapy program provides pre-vocational activity combined with intensive case management. This program is designed for veterans requiring a long term highly structured pre-vocational environment.

Therapy), 535 (mental health - vocational assistance), 575 (mental health – vocational assistance group) and 213 (rehab medicine – vocational assistance).

#### **D. Organization of This Report**

This report is divided into two sections. The first section examines changes in the program, over time, from FY 1993 when the monitoring first began through to FY 2003. In addition, data on critical monitors are presented by VISN, and finally, site data is presented on the descriptive characteristics of veterans admitted to the program, the extent to which veterans participated in the program and veteran outcomes at the time of discharge.

The second section of this report contains three appendices. Appendix A contains a copy of the monitoring data collection form. Appendix B contains 37 data tables derived from the monitoring data collection system. And finally, Appendix C contains summary data of the psychosocial rehabilitation services received by veterans as documented by stop codes recorded in VA's outpatient treatment file in Austin, Texas during FY 2003.



## CHAPTER II: THE CLINICAL OPERATION

### A. National Performance

Tables 1 - 6 in Appendix B present summary national data on number of veterans served for whom monitoring data were collected, veteran characteristics, program participation, and discharge outcomes for fiscal years 1993 - 2003. Highlighted below are key findings:

#### *Number of Veterans Served*

- During FY 2003, data were collected on 7,851 veterans discharged from the CWT/VI Program, which is 86.3% of all discharges reported to VA Central Office (Table 10).

#### *Veteran Characteristics*

- The majority of veterans admitted to the CWT/VI Program are referred by either VA outpatient programs or domiciliary care programs (40% and 34% respectively) (Table 2).
- During FY 2003, veterans in the CWT/VI Program averaged 47.4 years of age and 4.5% were female. Half of the veterans were African American (50.4%), 4.7% were Hispanic, 2.3% were of other ethnic backgrounds, and 42.6% were White. Only 8.1% were married; 62.7% were separated, widowed or divorced, and 29.2% had never married. Approximately 93% completed 12 years of education, and 42% completed at least some college (Table 2).
- Veterans admitted to the CWT/VI continued to have limited financial resources. Mean monthly incomes in the month prior to admission have steadily dropped from \$347 in FY 1993 to \$205 in FY 2003. Six out of ten veterans (62.5%) were homeless upon entry to CWT/VI (Table 3).
- In FY 2003, 43.0% of veterans entering the CWT/VI program reported that their usual employment pattern in the past three years was full-time competitive employment, but nine out of ten veterans (90.8%) reported not working at all in the month prior to admission.
- Substance abuse is highly prevalent in this population – at admission, 86.1% of veterans were diagnosed with a substance abuse problem: 73.5% reported problems with alcohol and 62.6% reported a drug problem (Table 4). In addition, over half of veterans (56.8%) reported that they had lost at least one job due to substance abuse (Table 3).
- The proportion of veterans diagnosed with a serious mental illness or with a dual

diagnosis (both a substance abuse disorder and a serious mental illness) is at its highest point since FY 1993: 47.8% of admitted veterans received a diagnosis of a serious mental illness, and 38.9% of veterans were dually diagnosed. (Table 4).

- Over half of the veterans in the CWT/VI Program (56.6%) were reported to have a disabling medical condition (Table 4).

#### *Program Participation*

- Over half of veterans (53.6%) discharged during FY 2003 were judged by program staff to have successfully completed the program (Table 5).
- During FY 2003, veterans worked an average of 26.3 hours per week in CWT/VI and had an average hourly wage of \$5.93, 78 cents above the current minimum wage of \$5.15/hour (Table 5).
- The proportion of veterans who had any TWE while in CWT/VI has more than doubled from FY 1993 (30.1%) to FY 2003 (82.0%). Workshop experiences were less common, with 31.8% working in a workshop at least once. (Table 5)
- The majority of placements (both TWE and workshop) are on VA grounds. Over two-thirds (68.8%) of veterans worked in a TWE placement at the VA compared with 17.6% who worked at a TWE in the community. One in four (25.1%) veterans participated in a workshop on VA grounds (Table 5).

#### *Outcomes*

- During FY 2003, 40.2% of veterans were discharged from CWT/VI with arrangements to be in competitive employment (full- or part-time). An additional 4.1% had arrangements at the time of discharge to be in some type of constructive activity (e.g. VA's Incentive Therapy, student, trainee or unpaid volunteer) and 10.8% were retired and/or disabled (Table 6).
- Since the first progress report there has been an increase in the percentage of veterans rated as improved in virtually all clinical areas (e.g. alcohol problems, drug problems, mental health problems and medical problems) and work performance areas (e.g. attendance and punctuality, acceptance of supervision, relationship with co-workers, productivity and quality of production), although these percentages were relatively unchanged from FY 2002 to FY 2003 (Table 6).

### **B. VISN Performance**

There are CWT/VI Programs located within every VISN. Tables 7, 8a and 8b provide data from FY 2003 on the 12 critical monitor measures organized by VISN. VISNs whose results are considered "outliers" are identified in Tables 7 and 8b with a shaded box. The performance of all VISNs is used as the norm for evaluating the performance of each

individual VISN. Those VISNs that are one standard deviation above or below the mean in the undesirable direction are considered outliers in Table 7. Outcome measures are presented in Tables 8a and 8b. Table 8a reports the raw outcome data by VISN and Table 8b report the same outcome measures, however, they have been risk adjusted using the same baseline characteristics as described earlier for CWT/VI sites (see Chapter I - determining outliers on critical monitors). VISNs that are statistically different in the undesirable direction from the median VISN after risk adjustment are considered outliers.

Table 9 of Appendix B provides a summary of the outlier status of each VISN. A total of 60 outliers out of a total of 286 measurements were identified for the 12 critical monitors across all 22 reporting VISNs. VISNs 1, 17 and 21 had the greatest number of outliers.

## **C. Site Performance**

### *1. Compliance with Program Monitoring*

As a matter of policy, CWT/VI sites are required to submit an Annual Report to VACO by the tenth day of the completion of each fiscal year. Completed Annual Reports are sent to the attention of the Associate Chief for Psychosocial Rehabilitation in Hampton, Virginia. Table 10 of Appendix C compares the number of discharges reported in the FY 2003 Annual Report to VA Central Office with the number of monitoring forms NEPEC received where the last date worked in CWT/VI occurred during FY 2003. In Table 10, there are 110 CWT/VI program site locations listed:

- 105 sites reported discharges to either VACO or NEPEC, and thus were considered to be operational.
- Five sites were considered to be closed during FY 2003: Philadelphia, PA (VISN 4); Durham, NC (VISN 6); Iron Mountain, MI (VISN 12); Sioux Falls, SD (VISN 23); Des Moines, IA (VISN 23). Philadelphia is expected to reopen the CWT/VI program in FY 2004.
- Dallas, TX and Fort Worth, TX (VISN 17) report combined data to VACO, and so data are combined on Table 10. Data from these two sites are reported separately on the remainder of the tables (Tables 11 – 37).
- Only two sites (Salisbury, NC and Sepulveda, CA) reported discharges in the Annual Report but did not submit any monitoring data to NEPEC; combined, these sites reported 16 discharges to VACO.
- Sites submitted monitoring data on 89.2% (site average) of the discharges they reported in their FY 2003 Annual Report. Nine CWT/VI program site locations were one standard deviation below the mean on proportion of discharges during FY 2003 for which monitoring data were collected.

## *2. Descriptive Program Measures and Critical Monitor Measures*

Tables 11 - 35 report site-specific data for FY 2003. Of the 105 operational sites, data are presented for 98 programs: 7 CWT/VI program sites were excluded from these tables because they submitted data on fewer than 10 veterans during FY 2003<sup>4</sup>. Critical monitors have been identified in these tables by shaded column titles (e.g. see Table 27 the column labeled "Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge") and sites whose results are considered "outliers" are identified with a shaded box.

Table 36 provides a summary of the outlier status of each site location. A total of 247 outliers out of 1,274 measurements were identified for the 13 critical monitors across all 98 CWT program site locations. Forty-nine of the 98 reporting sites (50.0%) were found to be outliers on one or none of the critical monitors, and 19 of the 98 (19.4%) program site locations were outliers on five or more of the 13 critical monitors.

## *3. Trend Data on Risk Adjusted Outcome Critical Monitors*

The last set of tables in Appendix B, Tables 37a – 37h provide trend data on outcome measures. For each of the eight risk adjusted critical outcome monitors, data from FY 2003 are presented by site with comparative data from previous progress reports (FY1996 and FY1998 through FY 2002).

## **D. The CWT/VI Program as One Component of the Larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service**

Appendix C contains 10 tables summarizing stop code data (see Chapter I) for Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services (PSR), as documented in VA's outpatient care file. Appendix C1 – Appendix C.5 present summary VISN data, while Appendix C.6 – Appendix C.10 present summary site data.

Altogether, 39,213 individual veterans received PSR services during FY 2003 and these veterans, on average, received 33.0 PSR visits. The overall duration of veteran participation in PSR was approximately 3 months (mean = 92.2 days) as determined by dates of their first recorded and last recorded stop codes during FY 2003. Of the 39,213 veterans, 58.3% (n=22,848) received CWT and/or CWT/TR services; 56.1% (n=22,013) received vocational assistance services and 24.2% (n=9,487) received Incentive Therapy services.

Because veterans may receive treatment from a number of programs within the PSR continuum of care, Appendices C5 and C10 report the type service the veterans first received in the PSR continuum of care. Overall, 46% of veterans received CWT and/or CWT/TR services first, 42.7% of veterans received vocational assistance services first and 14.0% of veterans received Incentive Therapy services first.

---

<sup>4</sup> The 7 CWT site locations excluded from the data tables are: Salisbury, NC (VISN 6); Columbia, MO (VISN 15); Poplar Bluff, MO (VISN 15); St. Louis, MO (VISN 15); El Paso, TX (VISN 18); Sepulveda, CA (VISN 22); Fargo, ND (VISN 23)

## **E. Summary**

As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT/VI will be an important element in fostering community adjustment and functional rehabilitation of veterans disabled by psychiatric or addictive disorders, particularly CWT/VI transitional work placements that are community-based.



## REFERENCES

- Fountaine and Howard. Program Evaluation of the Veterans Administrations  
Therapeutic Work Programs. Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation Studies and  
Evaluation Service, Veterans Administration, December 1987.
- Bond, G., Becker, D., Drake, R., et al: Implementing Supported Employment as an  
Evidence-Based Practice. *Psychiatric Services*, 52: 313-322, 2003.
- Leda, C., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Preliminary Information on the  
Monitoring Efforts of the Compensated Work Therapy Program. West Haven, CT;  
Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1995.
- Seibyl, C., Baldino, R., Corwel, L., Medak, S. and Rosenheck, R. Fourth Progress Report on  
the Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program Fiscal  
Year 2000. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2001.
- Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) /  
Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1996. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program  
Evaluation Center, 1997.
- Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Second Progress Report on the  
Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1998.  
West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1999.
- Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Third Progress Report on the  
Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1999.  
West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2000.
- Seibyl, C.L., Sieffert, D., Medak, S. and Rosenheck, R. Fifth Progress Report on the  
Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program. West Haven, CT;  
Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2002.



## **APPENDICES**

### **Contents of the Appendices:**

Appendix A. Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (Third Version)

Appendix B. CWT/VI Monitoring Data Tables

Appendix C. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Data Tables



**Appendix A: Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (Third Version)**



(88)

**Veterans Industries**  
**Monitoring Data Sheet**  
(Third Version—Revised 9/2000)  
Page 2 of 5

21. Do you currently receive any of the following kinds of financial support?  
(check one box for each question)

- |  |  |      |
|--|--|------|
| 1. Service Connected Psychiatry (include 0%) .....               | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (89) |
| 2. Service Connected Other (include 0%) .....                    | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |      |
| 3. NSC Pension .....   | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |      |
| 4. SSDI (Social Security Disability Insurance) .....             | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |      |
| 5. SSI (Supplemental Security Income) .....                      | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |      |
| 6. Social Security Retirement .....                              | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |      |
| 7. Other disability (e.g. workmen's compensation) .....          | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (96) |
| 8. Other public support (e.g. food stamps, general relief) ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |      |

22. In the past 30 days, how much money did you receive from these sources (dollar amount — no cents) (code 0000 if veteran does not receive financial support from any of the above)? .

\$

(100)

**C. MILITARY HISTORY**

23. Period of Service (check **longest** one)

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Pre-WWII (11/18–11/41)     | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Between Korean and Vietnam Eras (2/55–7/64) | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Post-Vietnam Era (5/75–7/90) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. World War II (12/41–12/46) |   | <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Persian Gulf (8/90– )        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Pre-Korean War (1/47–6/50) | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Vietnam Era (8/64–4/75)                     | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Post-Persian Gulf            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Korean War (7/50–1/55)     |   |  |

(101)

24. Did you ever receive hostile or friendly fire in combat zone? .....

☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

(102)

**D. LIVING SITUATION**

25. Where did you usually sleep during the month before you were admitted to the VI (or CWT) program? (select one)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. own apartment, room or house<br>(include boarding home) | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. halfway house, transitional living facility |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. someone else's apartment, room or house                 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. hotel, Single Room Occupancy (SRO)          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. hospital or nursing home                                | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. shelter for the homeless                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. domiciliary   | <input type="checkbox"/> 8. outdoors, abandoned building, car           |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. other (specify _____)                       |

DO NOT CODE

(105)

26. On the last date you were living in the community (e.g. not in a hospital or a health care type institution) were you homeless (**lacking a fixed, regular and adequate night-time residence**) .....

☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

(106)

107–109  
BLANK

26b. How long was that episode of homelessness (select one)?

**[Note: Length of time homeless is determined by figuring the number of months or years since the veteran last had a fixed, regular and adequate night-time residence, minus the time spent in any institution (hospital, halfway house, jail etc.)]**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. less than 1 month                       | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. at least 1 year but less than 2 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. at least 1 month but less than 6 months | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. two years or more                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. at least 6 months but less than 1 year  | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. unknown                               |

(110)

111–112  
BLANK

**E. HEALTH STATUS**

29. Have you **ever** been hospitalized for: (check one box for each question)

- |  |  |       |
|--|--|-------|
| 1. treatment of alcoholism? .....              | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (113) |
| 2. treatment of drug problems? .....           | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 3. a psychiatric problem (include PTSD)? ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (115) |

116  
BLANK

## Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet

(Third Version—Revised 9/2000)  
Page 3 of 5

31. Which of the following health problems do you currently have: (check one box for each question)
- |  |  |       |
|--|--|-------|
| 1. medical problem? .....                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (117) |
| 2. problem with alcohol? .....             | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 3. problem with drugs? .....               | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 4. psychiatric or emotional problem? ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |

32. Have you ever lost a job because of alcohol and/or drug problems? ..... ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes (121)

### F. LEGAL HISTORY

33. Have you ever been arrested? (check one) (122)
- |                                       |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0. no        | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. yes, 2–5 times  | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. yes, more than 10 times |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. yes, once | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. yes, 6–10 times |   |

34. Have you ever been incarcerated (i.e. been in jail or prison) in your life? (check one) (123)
- |                                |  |  |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0. no | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. yes, less than two weeks | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. yes, two weeks or more |
|--------------------------------|--|--|

### PART II CLINICIAN'S OBSERVATIONS AND IMPRESSIONS (to be completed by a clinician)

35. How was contact with the VI (or CWT) Program initiated? (select one) (124)
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. referral from VA inpatient unit<br><input type="checkbox"/> 2. referral from a VA outpatient program<br>(specify outpt program type _____)<br><input type="checkbox"/> 3. referral from a VA domiciliary | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. referral from a non-VA health<br>care provider/agency<br><input type="checkbox"/> 5. self-referred<br><input type="checkbox"/> 6. Vet Center referral<br><input type="checkbox"/> 7. other (specify _____) |
|--|--|

DO NOT CODE

☐ ☐

(126)

36. Is the veteran currently in a VA domiciliary or inpatient unit? ..... ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes (127)

128–141  
BLANK

40. Please indicate below the veteran's DSM-III-R diagnosis as determined by professionals in this program or from the medical record. (check one box for each question)
- |   |  |       |
|---|--|-------|
| 1. PTSD .....   | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (142) |
| 2. Anxiety Disorder (other than PTSD) .....               | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 3. Affective Disorder (other than Bipolar Disorder) ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 4. Bipolar Disorder .....                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (145) |
| 5. Schizophrenia .....                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 6. Psychosis (other than schizophrenia) .....             | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 7. Adjustment Disorder .....                              | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (148) |
| 8. Alcohol Abuse/Dependence .....                         | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 9. Drug Abuse/Dependence .....                            | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 10. Personality Disorder .....                            | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 11. Other (specify _____)                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (152) |

41. Please indicate below any disabling medical conditions that apply to this veteran as determined by professionals in this program or from the medical record. (check one box for each question)
- |   |  |       |
|---|--|-------|
| 1. Head Injury .....                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (153) |
| 2. Cerebro-Vascular Accident (e.g. Stroke) .....      | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 3. Spinal Cord Injury (Paraplegia/Quadriplegia) ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 4. Arthritis .....                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 5. Multiple Sclerosis .....                           | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (157) |
| 6. Liver Disease (e.g. Cirrhosis) .....               | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 7. Pulmonary Disease (e.g. COPD) .....                | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 8. Dementia .....                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 9. Orthopedic Problems (e.g. Back Injuries) .....     | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes |       |
| 10. Other (specify _____)                             | <input type="checkbox"/> 0 = No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 = Yes | (162) |

DO NOT CODE

☐ ☐

(164)

**Veterans Industries**  
**Monitoring Data Sheet**  
 (Third Version—Revised 9/2000)  
 Page 4 of 5

**COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT DISCHARGE**

Staff Member's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Last date worked in VI (or CWT) (mm,dd,yy) . . . . .

--	--	--	--

165–170  
BLANK

(176)

**I. PARTICIPATION IN VETERANS INDUSTRIES**

1. Hours worked in VI (or CWT):

1. Total hours worked . . . . .

(hrs) 

--	--	--	--	--	--

(182)

183–185  
BLANK

2. Earnings in VI (or CWT):

1. Total gross earnings (dollar amount — no cents) . . . . .

\$ 

--	--	--	--	--	--

(190)

191–194  
BLANK

3. While in VI (or CWT), did the veteran spend any time in the following job locations?  
 (check one box for each question)

1. Workshop on VA grounds . . . . .

☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

(195)

2. Supported employment (transitional work experience) on VA grounds . . . . .

☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

3. Workshop in the community . . . . .

☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

4. Supported employment (transitional work experience) in the community . . . . .

☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

(198)

4. Consider the following work performance and clinical areas and select the description that best  
**reflects changes** that occurred during the veteran's VI (or CWT) admission (check one box for each question).

**A. Work Performance Areas**

9. not applicable	0. deteriorated	1. unchanged	2. improved
----------------------	--------------------	-----------------	----------------

1. Personal hygiene/appearance . . . . .

--	--	--	--

(199)

2. Attendance and punctuality . . . . .

--	--	--	--

3. Acceptance of supervision . . . . .

--	--	--	--

4. Ability to get along with co-workers . . . . .

--	--	--	--

5. Productivity (output volume) . . . . .

--	--	--	--

6. Quality of production . . . . .

--	--	--	--

(204)

**B. Clinical Areas**

7. Alcohol problems . . . . .

--	--	--	--

(205)

8. Drug problems . . . . .

--	--	--	--

9. Mental health problems other than substance abuse . . . . .

--	--	--	--

10. Medical problems . . . . .

--	--	--	--

(208)

5. In your opinion, is this veteran ready for working in full-time competitive employment? . . . . .

☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

(209)

## Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet

(Third Version—Revised 9/2000)  
Page 5 of 5

### II. DISCHARGE STATUS

6. The veteran's mode of discharge was: (check only one)

- ☐ 1. Mutually agreed upon planned discharge
- ☐ 2. Involuntary discharge because of failure to comply with program requirements  
(specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- ☐ 3. Veteran left the program before planned discharge date and informed staff of his/her departure
- ☐ 4. Veteran left the program before planned discharge date and **did not** inform staff (AWOL)
- ☐ 5. Veteran became ill (physically or mentally) and was not able to work in VI (or CWT)
- ☐ 6. Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

(210)

DO NOT CODE

☐ ☐

(212)

7. Veteran's employment situation after discharge from VI (or CWT) will be: (check only one)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Full-time paid competitive employment<br>in the community | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Unemployed  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Part-time paid competitive employment<br>in the community | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Retired/disabled/too ill  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. VA's Incentive Therapy (IT)                               | <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Veteran left program without giving<br>indication of his/her employment situation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Student/trainee   | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Other (specify _____)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Unpaid volunteer  |   |

(213)

DO NOT CODE

☐ ☐

(215)

216–221  
BLANK

10. Veteran's housing situation after discharge from VI (or CWT) will be: (check only one)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Institution (e.g. hospital, nursing home, domiciliary)  | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. No available residence other than<br>homeless shelters, outdoors etc.          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Halfway house/transitional living program               | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Veteran left program without giving<br>indication of his/her housing situation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Own apartment, room or house<br>(include boarding home) | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other (specify _____)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Apartment, room or house of friend<br>or family member  |  |

(222)

DO NOT CODE

☐ ☐

(224)

### III. ARRANGEMENTS FOR POST DISCHARGE AFTERCARE

11. If the veteran has arrangements to work in competitive employment after discharge, are there plans for VI (or CWT) staff to provide any of the following types of support? (check one box for each question)

	0. no	3. yes, weekly	2. yes, monthly	1. yes, less often than monthly
a. office-based vocational counseling .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. on-the-job support .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. telephone support .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(225)

(226)

(227)



## **Appendix B: CWT/VI Monitoring Data Tables**



### **List of Tables for FY03**

- Table 1.** CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year
- Table 2.** Sociodemographic Characteristics, Service Era and Referral Source at Admission by Fiscal Year
- Table 3.** Employment, Income and Residential History at Admission by Fiscal Year
- Table 4.** Legal History, Health Status and Hospitalization History at Admission by Fiscal Year
- Table 5.** Program Participation by Fiscal Year
- Table 6.** Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Fiscal Year
- Table 7.** Program Participation by VISN for FY03
- Table 8a.** Unadjusted Critical Outcome Monitor Measures by VISN for FY03
- Table 8b.** Percent and Direction from Median Performance of VISN: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY03
- Table 9.** Summary of Outliers by VISN for FY03
- Table 10.** Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY03
- Table 11.** Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY03
- Table 12.** Ethnicity by Site for FY03
- Table 13.** Marital Status by Site for FY03
- Table 14.** Educational History by Site for FY03
- Table 15.** Military Service Era by Site for FY03
- Table 16.** Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY03
- Table 17.** Usual Employment Pattern during the Three Years Prior to Admission by Site for FY03
- Table 18.** Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY03
- Table 19.** Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY03

### **List of Tables for FY03 (cont.)**

**Table 20.** Veterans' Report of Public Financial Support at Admission by Site for FY03

**Table 21.** Income in the 30 Days Prior to Admission by Site for FY03

**Table 22.** Usual Residence in Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY03

**Table 23.** Homeless When Last in Community and History of Job Loss Due to Substance Use by Site for FY03

**Table 24.** Clinical Psychiatric Diagnoses at Admission by Site for FY03

**Table 25.** Presence of a Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition by Site for FY03

**Table 26.** Self-Reported Lifetime Hospitalizations for Mental Health Problems by Site for FY03

**Table 27.** Self-Reported Legal History by Site for FY03

**Table 28.** Type of Discharge from CWT/VI by Site for FY03

**Table 29.** Time Worked and Earnings in CWT/VI by Site for FY03

**Table 30a.** CWT/VI Workshop Participation by Site for FY03

**Table 30b.** CWT/VI Transitional Work Experience Participation by Site for FY03

**Table 31.** Average Work Improvement Score and Improvement in Work Performance Areas by Site for FY03

**Table 32.** Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Site for FY03

**Table 33.** Employment Status at Discharge by Site for FY03

**Table 34.** Housing Status at Discharge by Site for FY03

**Table 35.** Percent and Direction from Medical Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Measures for FY03

**Table 36.** Summary of Outliers by Site for FY03

**Table 37a.** Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year

**Table 37b.** Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year

**Table 37c.** Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year

**List of Tables for FY03 (cont.)**

**Table 37d.** Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year

**Table 37e.** Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year

**Table 37f.** Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year

**Table 37g.** Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year

**Table 37h.** Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year



**Table 1. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year †**

VISN		SITE	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY93-FY03
1	405	White River Junction, VT					7	10	1	0	2	9	18	47
1	518	Bedford, MA	64	385	478	508	538	487	482	348	365	262	279	4196
1	523	Boston, MA		15	4	0	0	0	0	30	51	27	25	152
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	2	56	124	73	80	154	126	65	87	67	85	919
1	608	Manchester, NH ††			21	18	22	10						71
1	631	Northampton, MA	3	35	72	143	123	144	214	231	176	150	113	1404
1	650	Providence, RI	2	7	24	49	65	59	35	33	43	48	51	416
1	689	West Haven, CT		37	69	60	92	69	39	90	87	95	105	743
2	528	Buffalo, NY		2	41	58	72	77	70	43	54	42	71	530
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	4	24	11	26	1	46	77	38	24	34	54	339
2	528A6	Bath, NY		17	23	31	46	17	39	67	109	116	66	531
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	4	25	32	51	40	47	43	64	64	67	46	483
2	528A8	Albany, NY	11	40	23	69	35	62	43	120	113	112	117	745
3	526	Bronx, NY				11	50	67	77	94	115	121	140	675
3	561	E. Orange, NJ			5	26	166	203	221	159	21	24	19	844
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	20	109	94	226	121	57	0†	3	132	158	155	1075
3	620	Montrose, NY			2	37	108	201	182	174	141	75	139	1059
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY				6	55	62	45	49	66	57	57	397
3	632	Northport, NY	2	7	30	66	117	155	81	33	96	63	44	694
4	529	Butler, PA				8	6	24	49	49	45	54	27	262
4	542	Coatesville, PA	43	211	194	282	229	252	289	265	261	259	298	2583
4	595	Lebanon, PA		50	85	96	90	105	102	100	94	85	93	900
4	642	Philadelphia, PA ††		1	2	3	29	14	67	46	22	20		204
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	9	58	105	157	172	210	153	168	170	183	197	1582
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA									2	31	28	61
5	512	Baltimore, MD				8	58	41	27	21	12	48	34	249
5	512A4	Ft. Howard, MD ††			1	5	10	10	24	15				65
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	5	0	10	26	24	23	33	13	41	142	157	474
5	613	Martinsburg, WV				26	0	217	205	223	212	149		1032
5	688	Washington, DC	4	16	58	52	57	75	40	93	82	123	118	718
6	558	Durham, NC	0	4	17	19	22	18	19	12	10	2	0	123
6	590	Hampton, VA	20	124	116	118	113	124	72	75	86	75	91	1014
6	637	Asheville, NC		1	6	4	0	0	9	17	24	16	17	94
6	652	Richmond, VA		6	71	41	42	24	31	2	2	11	17	247
6	658	Salem, VA	4	29	34	27	52	25	68	42	38	39	77	435
6	659	Salisbury, NC										7	0	7
7	508	Atlanta, GA		13	228	170	112	139	179	307	195	119	114	1576
7	509	Augusta, GA	4	19	11	30	44	54	60	31	50	42	49	394
7	521	Birmingham, AL						2	59	68	56	62	51	298
7	534	Charleston, SC	5	20	51	47	36	52	64	59	80	80	59	553
7	544	Columbia, SC									1	60	49	110
7	557	Dublin, GA							4	15	0	20	34	73
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL									21	37	66	124
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	17	86	69	72	61	88	82	76	72	51	98	772
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	2	20	67	71	73	132	165	165	135	103	80	1013
8	546	Miami, FL			15	20	20	30	44	56	39	47	52	323
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL						19	19	25	35	38	59	176
8	573	Gainesville, FL			2	9	42	79	85	75	62	63	68	485
8	573A4	Lake City, FL ††				1	1	14						16
8	673	Tampa, FL	1	43	64	66	59	57	87	120	99	76	90	762
9	596	Lexington, KY ††	22	104	101	87	74	62	50	51				551
9	614	Memphis, TN			1	4	32	25	33	39	37	31	37	239
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	5	2	104	88	127	143	139	106	126	86	97	1023
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	15	82	106	101	122	126	143	156	130	75	54	1110
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	11	116	4	54	87	92	68	85	122	121	141	901
10	539	Cincinnati, OH									152	112	168	432
10	541	Cleveland, OH	5	85	124	109	120	154	132	145	164	143	99	1280
10	552	Dayton, OH			1	11	13	9	41	21	9	16	17	138

**Table 1 cont. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year †**

VISN		SITE	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY93-FY03
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI						5	6	3	14	24	13	65
11	515	Battle Creek, MI		18	78	127	101	83	86	61	57	57	39	707
11	550	Danville, IL	9	13	25	69	1	0	34	34	50	43	31	309
11	583	Indianapolis, IN					16	46	45	39	31	54	65	296
12	556	North Chicago, IL	16	69	55	76	0	0	111	211	205	165	181	1089
12	578	Hines, IL		51	52	97	121	140	128	160	182	146	91	1168
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI									7	1	0	8
12	607	Madison, WI										2	16	18
12	676	Tomah, WI		17	48	65	51	33	53	50	77	41	47	482
12	695	Milwaukee, WI		17	72	55	53	66	86	82	69	56	59	615
15	543	Columbia, MO			6	9	12	0	15	5	4	0	4	55
15	589	Kansas City, MO	4	96	189	159	105	118	129	110	0	7	91	1008
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO				9	11	11	5	6	1	7	2	52
15	657	St. Louis, MO										1	1	2
15	677	Topeka, KS	1	55	34	84	64	38	23	7	83	27	27	443
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	3	5	9	2	1	9	45	61	3	48	41	227
16	520	Biloxi, MS		6	16	54	114	112	122	159	129	131	181	1024
16	580	Houston, TX	2	20	52	81	113	87	114	132	135	146	186	1068
16	586	Jackson, MS				1	11	21	25	44	50	16	40	208
16	598	Little Rock, AR		26	4	22	169	186	205	250	260	212	134	1468
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK		22	32	29	81	48	16	51	46	58	41	424
17	549	Dallas, TX	43	152	231	293	344	278	286	327	346	385	385	3070
17	549A4	Bonham, TX			17	2	36	39	83	65	65	47	34	388
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX									70	61	111	242
17	671	San Antonio, TX			6	18	28	30	19	25	23	24	51	224
17	674	Temple, TX		9	19	45	82	45	33	39	23	117	257	669
17	674A4	Waco, TX ††	13	61	76	13	5	41	0	2	23	7		241
18	501	Albuquerque, NM								2	19	59	94	174
18	644	Phoenix, AZ ††					15	56	21	23	52			167
18	649	Prescott, AZ	7	14	28	29	76	72	87	86	122	63	56	640
18	678	Tucson, AZ			16	41	51	67	51	62	52	59	56	455
18	756	El Paso, TX					2	2	4	2	3	4	3	20
19	567GB	Colorado Springs, CO										7	10	17
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	1	14	29	16	24	23	18	23	30	24	21	223
19	666	Sheridan, WY						12	11	11	4	0	11	49
20	463	Anchorage, AK		14	17	45	75	40	21	24	34	32	27	329
20	648	Portland, OR			21	34	19	29	45	80	88	76	88	480
20	653	Roseburg, OR		9	18	15	22	14	30	32	41	9	10	200
20	663	Seattle, WA ††			5	12	20	14	3	6	0	0		60
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	5	29	139	89	113	69	68	56	35	50	84	737
20	687	Walla Walla, WA										11	12	23
20	692	White City, OR	3	44	44	115	147	147	168	87	85	92	122	1054
21	459	Honolulu, HI		2	6	8	8	9	9	18	10	16	10	96
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	45	191	59	1	10	52	36	42	47	66	68	617
21	654	Reno, NV		1	3	5	1	12	9	12	12	9	16	80
21	662	San Francisco, CA	8	49	62	86	79	98	88	44	96	99	70	779
22	600	Long Beach, CA		6	4	46	35	59	60	55	23	42	31	361
22	605	Loma Linda, CA		3	44	76	69	73	84	78	89	85	73	674
22	664	San Diego, CA					3	10	21	23	24	45	42	168
22	691	West LA, CA				10	22	0	22	46	5	17	29	151
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	10	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
23	437	Fargo, ND											2	2
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD ††									15	10		25
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	3	37	88	82	91	66	58	54	51	57	34	621
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	15	70	96	86	98	66	83	75	83	64	81	817
23	618	Minneapolis, MN								15	12	42	36	105
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA						4	18		7	1	0	57
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	3	29	52	103	44	92	71	45	19	29	12	499
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	10	62	109	172	178	223	221	181	100	118	256	1630
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>485</b>	<b>3,080</b>	<b>4,562</b>	<b>5,625</b>	<b>6,412</b>	<b>6,875</b>	<b>7,405</b>	<b>7,496</b>	<b>7,554</b>	<b>7,285</b>	<b>7,851</b>	<b>64,630</b>
<b>SITE AVERAGE</b>			<b>11</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>548</b>
<b>SITE S.D.</b>			<b>13</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>609</b>

† Due to missing data, sixty-two veterans could not be assigned a fiscal year and three veterans could not be assigned a site.

†† Site has either closed or undergone consolidation.

**Table 2. Sociodemographic Characteristics, Service Era and Referral Source at Admission by Fiscal Year**

	<b>FY93</b>	<b>FY94</b>	<b>FY95</b>	<b>FY96</b>	<b>FY97</b>	<b>FY98</b>	<b>FY99</b>	<b>FY00</b>	<b>FY01</b>	<b>FY02</b>	<b>FY03</b>
<b>VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>n=485</b>	<b>n=3080</b>	<b>n=4562</b>	<b>n=5625</b>	<b>n=6412</b>	<b>n=6875</b>	<b>n=7405</b>	<b>n=7496</b>	<b>n=7554</b>	<b>n=7285</b>	<b>n=7851</b>
<b>SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC</b>											
Age (mean years)	43.1	43.0	42.2	43.8	44.4	44.9	45.4	46.0	46.6	47.0	47.4
Female	3.1%	3.2%	3.4%	4.1%	4.0%	4.5%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%	4.5%
Ethnicity											
White	57.1%	55.1%	50.2%	49.5%	50.4%	49.2%	47.0%	44.5%	46.0%	42.8%	42.6%
African American	36.0%	39.1%	43.7%	43.2%	41.7%	43.3%	45.9%	48.3%	46.4%	49.7%	50.4%
Hispanic	4.4%	3.5%	2.4%	3.6%	4.4%	4.4%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	4.8%	4.7%
Other	2.5%	2.3%	3.7%	3.7%	3.5%	3.1%	2.3%	2.6%	3.1%	2.7%	2.3%
Marital status											
married	10.7%	9.6%	9.1%	9.3%	9.3%	8.9%	7.8%	7.6%	7.9%	7.6%	8.1%
separated/widowed/divorced	58.8%	61.1%	62.1%	61.0%	61.7%	63.0%	63.2%	63.3%	63.7%	64.5%	62.7%
never married	31.6%	29.3%	28.9%	29.7%	29.1%	28.1%	29.0%	29.2%	28.5%	28.0%	29.2%
Education											
< 12 years	14.2%	12.1%	10.2%	10.0%	11.4%	10.1%	9.8%	8.8%	7.6%	7.8%	7.3%
12 years	47.4%	50.5%	50.8%	49.9%	49.5%	49.5%	49.6%	50.0%	50.7%	51.8%	50.7%
> 12 years	38.4%	37.5%	39.1%	40.1%	39.1%	40.5%	40.7%	41.3%	41.7%	40.3%	42.0%
<b>SERVICE ERA</b>											
Persian Gulf era	1.7%	2.3%	2.7%	3.1%	3.1%	4.1%	4.4%	4.6%	5.0%	5.9%	6.3%
Post-Vietnam era	26.5%	29.7%	32.5%	34.4%	35.1%	35.7%	37.7%	40.2%	40.9%	43.2%	47.0%
Vietnam era	56.5%	54.8%	53.7%	51.9%	52.8%	52.4%	50.8%	48.8%	48.8%	46.3%	43.3%
Between Korean and Vietnam eras	8.1%	8.8%	7.7%	7.7%	6.7%	6.3%	5.8%	5.2%	4.4%	4.0%	3.0%
Korean era	4.1%	2.9%	2.2%	2.0%	1.9%	1.3%	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%
All other service eras	3.1%	1.5%	1.2%	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
<b>REFERRAL SOURCE</b>											
VA inpatient unit	33.5%	32.6%	27.6%	24.7%	17.9%	13.9%	13.3%	11.6%	11.0%	11.4%	10.3%
VA outpatient program	25.1%	24.7%	27.3%	30.7%	36.1%	38.5%	38.2%	40.5%	40.4%	40.5%	40.3%
VA domiciliary	26.2%	26.1%	26.6%	28.5%	31.0%	33.1%	34.4%	32.3%	33.7%	33.4%	33.5%
Non-VA health care provider or agency	1.3%	2.7%	2.4%	1.8%	1.7%	2.2%	2.7%	3.5%	3.8%	2.9%	2.6%
Self-referred	4.6%	6.9%	10.1%	9.7%	8.4%	7.6%	7.4%	7.8%	7.7%	7.6%	9.1%
Vet Center	2.1%	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%	1.4%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%
Other	7.3%	5.9%	4.6%	3.5%	3.7%	3.8%	3.2%	3.3%	2.7%	3.2%	3.2%

**Table 3. Employment, Income and Residential History at Admission by Fiscal Year**

<b>VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>FY93 n=485</b>	<b>FY94 n=3080</b>	<b>FY95 n=4562</b>	<b>FY96 n=5625</b>	<b>FY97 n=6412</b>	<b>FY98 n=6875</b>	<b>FY99 n=7405</b>	<b>FY00 n=7496</b>	<b>FY01 n=7554</b>	<b>FY02 n=7285</b>	<b>FY03 n=7851</b>
<b>EMPLOYMENT HISTORY</b>											
<b>Worked previously in CWT</b>	33.1%	27.6%	24.1%	26.8%	26.1%	27.7%	27.7%	29.5%	31.1%	31.6%	31.5%
<b>Usual employment pattern past 3 years</b>											
Competitively employed full-time	31.1%	36.1%	37.5%	38.7%	40.1%	40.6%	42.5%	43.3%	44.1%	42.4%	43.0%
Competitively emp regular part-time	7.1%	7.3%	9.6%	8.7%	8.4%	7.9%	8.5%	8.4%	8.3%	8.9%	8.4%
Competitively emp irregular part-time	21.7%	20.5%	20.7%	19.3%	19.5%	20.6%	20.7%	20.4%	21.0%	22.5%	23.0%
Student/trainee	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.5%
Unpaid volunteer	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
Retired/disabled	10.5%	9.7%	7.8%	8.3%	7.9%	7.2%	6.0%	6.9%	6.5%	5.6%	5.4%
Unemployed	26.2%	23.0%	21.1%	21.2%	20.8%	20.2%	18.6%	17.6%	16.0%	16.6%	16.3%
Other	2.2%	2.2%	2.0%	2.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.6%	2.4%	3.0%	3.0%	3.2%
<b>Usually employed or involved in constructive activity past 3 years</b>	61.2%	65.1%	69.1%	68.0%	69.2%	70.2%	72.9%	73.0%	74.4%	74.8%	75.1%
<b>Days worked for pay past 30 days</b>											
none	87.5%	89.5%	88.8%	88.1%	88.2%	88.3%	88.8%	89.5%	90.7%	90.7%	90.8%
1-19 days	8.6%	7.4%	7.4%	8.4%	8.6%	8.0%	8.1%	8.2%	6.8%	7.0%	7.2%
> 19 days	4.0%	3.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.2%	3.8%	3.1%	2.3%	2.6%	2.3%	2.0%
<b>Mean # of days worked for pay past 30</b>	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0
<b>Ever lost a job due to substance abuse</b>	47.6%	52.9%	55.0%	55.4%	55.9%	55.9%	57.7%	58.5%	58.2%	57.7%	56.8%
<b>INCOME HISTORY</b>											
<b>Public Financial Support</b>											
SC psychiatry	10.2%	9.5%	6.7%	6.3%	6.1%	5.4%	5.3%	5.0%	4.83%	4.4%	4.1%
SC medical	14.9%	12.4 %	11.8%	13.4%	13.4%	12.4%	12.9%	13.5%	12.2%	12.2%	11.8%
NSC pension	2.9%	3.9%	3.4%	3.6%	3.6%	3.0%	3.2%	4.8%	4.8%	4.3%	4.5%
Receives any VA benefits	25.6%	23.2%	20.3%	21.5%	21.3%	19.1%	19.8%	21.6%	20.2%	19.5%	19.1%
Social Security benefits (SSI, SSDI)	22.3%	16.1%	13.1%	15.2%	12.7%	9.1%	9.4%	9.4%	9.0%	8.2%	7.0%
Any disability (VA and/or SS)	38.1%	31.9%	27.4%	30.3%	28.3%	24.3%	24.8%	25.2%	23.8%	23.0%	21.3%
<b>Mean employment income past 30 days</b>	\$51.68	\$35.65	\$46.36	\$45.39	\$42.02	\$46.60	\$45.75	\$40.83	\$38.79	\$37.52	\$38.83
<b>Mean public support income past 30 days</b>	\$302.76	\$238.02	\$206.55	\$231.16	\$212.56	\$196.80	\$192.99	\$190.69	\$178.20	\$174.00	\$166.52
<b>Total income received past 30 days</b>	\$346.80	\$270.81	\$250.31	\$270.96	\$246.49	\$235.87	\$231.47	\$227.89	\$216.72	\$211.36	\$205.25
<b>RESIDENTIAL HISTORY</b>											
<b>Usual residence past 30 days</b>											
Own apartment, room or house	25.6%	23.8%	20.5%	21.7%	20.8%	18.6%	17.5%	16.9%	17.5%	16.3%	16.7%
Apartment, room or house of family or friend	18.5%	15.8%	16.6%	15.6%	13.3%	14.9%	13.6%	14.8%	14.4%	15.8%	16.6%
Hospital or nursing home	11.0%	13.1%	13.4%	12.3%	10.7%	9.3%	9.8%	8.6%	6.7%	6.8%	6.3%
Domiciliary	19.7%	21.1%	22.4%	23.8%	26.8%	27.4%	27.8%	24.8%	27.3%	26.7%	25.1%
Halfway house, transitional living program	5.8%	7.4%	8.3%	9.4%	10.6%	12.0%	14.0%	16.8%	14.4%	14.4%	13.9%
Hotel or SRO	3.1%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%
Shelter	10.8%	12.6%	13.2%	11.6%	12.6%	12.5%	12.0%	12.2%	13.1%	13.4%	14.4%
Outdoors, abandoned building etc.	3.9%	4.0%	3.8%	3.9%	3.5%	3.1%	3.4%	3.7%	3.6%	3.6%	4.5%
Other	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%	1.7%	1.9%	1.3%
<b>Homeless when last living in community</b>	53.4%	56.8%	59.8%	58.2%	57.9%	59.0%	61.8%	60.8%	60.4%	61.7%	62.5%
<b>Currently in Domiciliary or Inpatient Unit</b>	55.3%	49.7%	40.5%	40.1%	38.3%	38.5%	39.3%	37.8%	40.4%	41.5%	41.8%

**Table 4. Legal History, Health Status and Hospitalization History at Admission by Fiscal Year**

<b>VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>FY93 n=485</b>	<b>FY94 n=3080</b>	<b>FY95 n=4562</b>	<b>FY96 n=5625</b>	<b>FY97 n=6412</b>	<b>FY98 n=6875</b>	<b>FY99 n=7405</b>	<b>FY00 n=7496</b>	<b>FY01 n=7554</b>	<b>FY02 n=7285</b>	<b>FY03 n=7851</b>
<b>LEGAL HISTORY</b>											
<b>Arrest History</b>											
Never been arrested	24.5%	23.0%	21.8%	22.1%	21.9%	21.8%	20.4%	19.0%	19.7%	19.5%	18.2%
Arrested once	22.0%	19.6%	18.2%	18.2%	18.9%	18.0%	19.6%	18.5%	18.1%	16.7%	16.6%
Arrested 2-5 times	33.7%	35.3%	38.0%	38.5%	38.4%	40.7%	40.1%	40.8%	40.3%	42.3%	43.4%
Arrested 6-10 times	9.8%	10.4%	10.9%	10.7%	9.4%	9.3%	10.0%	10.1%	10.8%	10.7%	11.0%
Arrested more than 10 times	10.0%	11.8%	11.2%	10.4%	11.4%	10.2%	10.0%	11.6%	11.1%	11.0%	10.9%
<b>Incarceration History</b>											
Never incarcerated	38.7%	35.4%	33.9%	34.2%	32.5%	32.8%	31.9%	29.2%	30.8%	31.5%	29.7%
Incarcerated less than two weeks	22.6%	25.2%	24.2%	24.5%	24.8%	25.5%	22.6%	23.6%	20.6%	20.0%	19.3%
Incarcerated more than two weeks	38.7%	39.4%	41.8%	41.3%	42.7%	41.7%	45.5%	47.2%	47.6%	48.6%	51.0%
<b>CLINICAL ASSESSMENTS</b>											
<b>Psychiatric Diagnoses</b>											
Alcohol abuse/dependency	62.7%	69.3%	72.2%	72.2%	73.6%	74.7%	74.3%	74.6%	75.3%	74.5%	73.5%
Drug abuse/dependency	43.7%	50.6%	54.4%	55.1%	55.5%	57.7%	59.7%	61.6%	60.2%	62.5%	62.6%
Any substance abuse/dependency	72.6%	78.8%	82.3%	82.5%	84.3%	85.6%	85.5%	86.5%	86.8%	86.6%	86.1%
Serious mental illness †	46.5%	43.3%	40.9%	43.1%	43.0%	43.3%	45.7%	45.1%	36.0%	39.9%	47.8%
Dual diagnosis ††	25.7%	29.5%	29.3%	31.1%	32.6%	34.3%	36.4%	36.3%	28.5%	31.9%	38.9%
<b>Any psychiatric disorder</b>	94.8%	95.4%	95.6%	96.4%	96.5%	96.7%	96.9%	97.1%	96.6%	97.2%	97.0%
<b>Any disabling medical condition</b>	42.8%	44.8%	46.1%	45.2%	44.2%	45.6%	47.2%	48.7%	51.2%	53.0%	56.6%
<b>Any psychiatric disorder or disabling medical condition</b>	98.8%	98.6%	98.9%	99.2%	99.2%	99.5%	99.6%	99.6%	99.7%	99.7%	99.7%
<b>HOSPITALIZATION HISTORY</b>											
<b>Ever hospitalized for alcohol problems</b>	64.3%	70.4%	71.7%	71.2%	70.4%	70.8%	70.0%	69.2%	68.2%	65.4%	64.5%
<b>Ever hospitalized for drug problems</b>	42.5%	51.1%	53.9%	54.3%	52.8%	53.4%	55.3%	56.3%	54.0%	54.7%	54.3%
<b>Ever hospitalized for psychiatric problems</b>	50.8%	49.2%	43.3%	44.9%	42.9%	42.0%	42.9%	42.4%	41.1%	39.0%	37.8%
<b>Ever hospitalized for any mental health problem</b>	88.8%	91.6%	90.5%	89.7%	88.8%	87.8%	87.4%	86.6%	85.3%	83.4%	82.0%

† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories: schizophrenia, other psychotic disorder, affective disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD and other anxiety disorders.

†† Dual Diagnosis is defined as having both a substance abuse disorder and a serious psychiatric disorder.

**Table 5. Program Participation by Fiscal Year**

<b>VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>FY93 n=485</b>	<b>FY94 n=3080</b>	<b>FY95 n=4562</b>	<b>FY96 n=5625</b>	<b>FY97 n=6412</b>	<b>FY98 n=6875</b>	<b>FY99 n=7405</b>	<b>FY00 n=7496</b>	<b>FY01 n=7554</b>	<b>FY02 n=7285</b>	<b>FY03 n=7851</b>
<b>TYPE OF DISCHARGE</b>											
Mutually agreed upon/planned discharge	42.1%	41.4%	3.3%	43.1%	44.6%	46.9%	51.2%	51.3%	51.3%	53.1%	53.6%
Failure to comply with program requirements	9.2%	12.7%	14.0%	15.6%	16.0%	17.0%	16.1%	15.3%	17.3%	16.6%	16.0%
Left before planned discharge (informed staff)	14.5%	14.0%	14.0%	12.1%	14.3%	13.9%	11.7%	12.3%	11.5%	11.8%	11.1%
Left before planned discharge (did not inform staff)	23.8%	24.9%	26.7%	21.6%	19.0%	16.7%	15.9%	15.0%	14.4%	13.4%	14.1%
Veteran became to ill to participate	9.4%	5.6%	4.7%	5.4%	4.7%	4.4%	4.0%	4.2%	4.1%	4.0%	4.2%
Other	1.1%	1.4%	1.5%	2.2%	1.4%	1.1%	1.2%	1.9%	1.4%	1.1%	1.0%
<b>HOURS AND EARNINGS IN CWT/VI</b>											
Total mean hours worked in CWT/VI	77.0	224.2	374.6	462.1	510.9	515.6	556.9	538.4	492.9	548.4	535.4
Mean hours worked per week	19.9	21.7	23.8	23.3	25.3	25.4	25.5	26.1	25.8	26.3	26.3
Mean weeks worked	3.9	10.0	15.5	19.0	19.6	19.9	21.7	21.2	19.0	20.7	20.0
Total mean earnings in CWT/VI	\$307.94	\$1,025.07	\$1,835.60	\$2,277.83	\$2,573.87	\$2,819.27	\$3,235.00	\$3,107.16	\$2,897.56	\$3,017.11	\$3,223.38
Mean hourly wage	\$3.82	\$4.23	\$4.59	\$4.49	\$4.88	\$5.29	\$5.51	\$5.59	\$5.73	\$5.83	\$5.93
Mean weekly earnings	\$83.28	\$99.02	\$118.95	\$113.49	\$133.23	\$142.29	\$146.63	\$155.60	\$152.10	\$159.70	\$160.90
<b>LOCATION OF CWT PARTICIPATION</b>											
Any Workshop Placement	84.1%	78.1%	68.0%	66.8%	58.2%	51.5%	42.3%	41.2%	37.4%	34.7%	31.8%
Workshop on VA Grounds	76.1%	73.4%	56.0%	56.0%	49.2%	43.2%	33.4%	30.2%	27.4%	27.2%	25.1%
Workshop in the Community	9.5%	63.6%	13.8%	12.6%	10.4%	10.4%	11.1%	12.4%	10.9%	8.9%	8.5%
Workshop placement only	67.2%	55.8%	40.4%	36.3%	29.7%	34.5%	19.1%	20.3%	20.4%	16.9%	17.6%
Any Transitional Work Experience Placement	30.1%	43.3%	58.8%	62.6%	69.7%	75.1%	80.5%	79.2%	78.7%	82.7%	82.0%
Transitional Work Experience on VA Grounds	15.1%	25.9%	46.4%	52.5%	58.4%	63.0%	67.4%	67.7%	66.6%	69.6%	68.8%
Transitional Work Experience in the Community	16.1%	20.1%	16.2%	14.7%	16.8%	17.6%	18.1%	16.5%	16.5%	18.2%	17.6%
Transitional Work Experience Only	14.2%	21.1%	31.3%	32.0%	41.2%	48.1%	57.2%	58.3%	61.7%	64.9%	67.8%

**Table 6. Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Fiscal Year**

<b>VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>FY93 n=485</b>	<b>FY94 n=3080</b>	<b>FY95 n=4562</b>	<b>FY96 n=5625</b>	<b>FY97 n=6412</b>	<b>FY98 n=6875</b>	<b>FY99 n=7405</b>	<b>FY00 n=7496</b>	<b>FY01 n=7554</b>	<b>FY02 n=7285</b>	<b>FY03 n=7851</b>
<b>IMPROVEMENT IN WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS†</b>											
Personal hygiene/appearance	18.8%	23.9%	29.0%	34.2%	45.8%	55.9%	62.0%	66.2%	67.3%	70.5%	70.6%
Attendance and punctuality	22.0%	27.2%	31.5%	36.7%	48.4%	56.2%	61.0%	61.2%	63.8%	65.8%	66.6%
Acceptance of Supervision	23.7%	31.4%	34.6%	39.8%	49.6%	58.3%	62.9%	64.2%	66.4%	69.6%	70.4%
Relationship with co-workers	23.3%	32.9%	35.0%	40.1%	50.1%	57.6%	62.9%	64.7%	66.6%	69.4%	69.6%
Productivity	40.4%	41.7%	39.2%	44.6%	55.1%	62.1%	64.9%	66.4%	67.0%	69.6%	70.5%
Quality of production	35.4%	40.2%	38.9%	43.9%	54.0%	61.2%	64.9%	66.6%	67.8%	69.9%	70.8%
Average work improvement score ††	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.29	1.41	1.50	1.55	1.57	1.59	1.62	1.63
<b>VETERAN IS READY FOR COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT</b>	38.4%	42.7%	42.9%	45.9%	51.3%	54.8%	59.8%	60.3%	59.7%	61.6%	64.4%
<b>IMPROVEMENT IN CLINICAL AREAS †</b>											
Alcohol problems	26.3%	28.6%	31.8%	34.4%	45.5%	55.3%	61.2%	63.4%	63.8%	65.8%	65.9%
Drug problems	19.4%	25.0%	26.4%	31.0%	42.5%	53.7%	59.9%	62.9%	62.3%	64.6%	64.6%
Mental health problems	21.4%	22.1%	20.0%	22.7%	32.8%	41.1%	45.5%	47.1%	48.9%	51.5%	52.7%
Medical problems	10.6%	12.1%	14.2%	12.9%	23.7%	31.1%	34.9%	35.2%	39.6%	39.9%	39.4%
<b>EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT DISCHARGE</b>											
Competitively employed full-time	15.5%	17.1%	22.5%	24.3%	28.5%	32.4%	34.0%	36.5%	37.3%	35.2%	35.3%
Competitively employed part-time	5.8%	3.8%	2.9%	4.0%	4.6%	4.7%	4.9%	4.8%	3.9%	5.1%	4.9%
Incentive Therapy (IT)	2.1%	2.3%	2.8%	1.7%	1.4%	1.3%	1.5%	1.5%	1.3%	1.5%	1.5%
Student/trainee	2.9%	3.1%	2.6%	3.3%	3.2%	2.5%	3.1%	3.2%	2.8%	2.9%	3.0%
Unpaid volunteer	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%
Unemployed	20.3%	26.1%	27.8%	29.2%	29.5%	27.7%	27.6%	24.6%	25.8%	26.8%	27.4%
Retired/disabled	16.4%	13.6%	8.9%	10.9%	10.7%	10.2%	9.4%	10.5%	10.9%	10.4%	10.8%
Unknown	30.2%	28.1%	28.1%	23.3%	19.3%	18.8%	15.8%	14.8%	14.4%	13.4%	13.0%
Other	6.6%	5.8%	4.0%	3.0%	2.4%	2.1%	3.4%	3.9%	3.3%	4.4%	3.7%
<b>HOUSING STATUS AT DISCHARGE</b>											
Hospital, nursing home or domiciliary	26.8%	21.6%	16.3%	14.3%	13.4%	13.9%	13.1%	13.5%	13.1%	13.7%	12.9%
Halfway house/transitional living program	3.5%	5.0%	4.6%	6.7%	7.2%	8.5%	9.3%	10.9%	11.6%	13.4%	12.6%
Own apartment, room or house	23.5%	27.9%	29.6%	35.0%	37.2%	36.3%	38.8%	35.4%	33.7%	33.3%	35.0%
Apartment, room, house of family/friend	11.5%	12.0%	14.8%	13.5%	15.8%	16.8%	15.8%	16.8%	17.3%	17.9%	18.1%
No available residence/homeless	3.7%	2.8%	4.8%	5.9%	5.4%	4.7%	4.7%	5.2%	6.2%	5.8%	5.7%
Unknown	30.2%	29.9%	28.6%	23.1%	20.0%	18.6%	16.9%	16.8%	16.4%	14.3%	14.6%
Other	0.9%	1.0%	1.3%	1.5%	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.7%	1.5%	1.2%

† Improvement is noted for only those veterans with problems in that area.

†† Average Work Improvement score is the mean of five work performance areas, range 0-2 (0 = deteriorated, 1 = unchanged, and 2 = improved)

**Table 7. Program Participation by VISN for FY03**

			VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION			
			Serious Mental Illness †† %	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge %	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements %	Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week %	Average Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI \$
VISN †							
VISN	#SITES	N					
1	7	676	65.5%	55.3%	14.2%	<b>18.9</b>	7.41
2	5	354	54.0%	62.4%	14.4%	30.9	<b>5.10</b>
3	6	554	45.3%	63.8%	15.2%	32.5	6.07
4	6	643	38.9%	51.2%	15.1%	29.2	5.44
5	4	458	50.7%	66.2%	9.8%	29.0	5.33
6	6	202	<b>28.2%</b>	67.3%	18.3%	33.3	5.54
7	8	520	41.9%	56.2%	<b>22.0%</b>	32.0	5.74
8	5	349	<b>34.7%</b>	55.3%	10.9%	32.6	5.50
9	3	188	43.6%	<b>45.2%</b>	<b>22.3%</b>	32.1	5.33
10	4	425	44.7%	53.6%	14.4%	<b>16.6</b>	6.21
11	4	148	55.0%	55.7%	16.1%	29.4	5.89
12	6	394	46.4%	53.0%	<b>21.6%</b>	25.2	6.17
15	6	166	67.5%	<b>42.8%</b>	<b>25.9%</b>	31.3	5.80
16	5	582	<b>35.1%</b>	46.0%	12.4%	31.9	5.80
17	6	838	52.6%	35.6%	16.8%	<b>15.3</b>	<b>5.23</b>
18	4	209	63.2%	<b>45.0%</b>	18.2%	25.9	5.98
19	3	42	71.4%	52.4%	16.7%	24.8	5.94
20	6	343	45.6%	57.9%	20.5%	25.7	6.60
21	4	164	53.0%	46.3%	10.4%	25.2	7.72
22	5	175	55.4%	57.7%	6.9%	24.9	5.90
23	8	421	46.8%	66.3%	18.1%	23.9	6.28
<b>VISN Avg</b>			<b>49.5%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>16.2%</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>\$5.95</b>
<b>VISN S.D.</b>			<b>10.9%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>\$0.64</b>
<b>VETERAN Avg</b>			<b>47.8%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>\$7.17</b>

† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

†† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories: schizophrenia, other psychotic disorder, affective disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD and other anxiety disorders.

**Table 8a. Unadjusted Critical Outcome Monitor Measures by VISN for FY03**

VISN †			AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
VISN	#SITES	# VETS								
1	7	676	1.36	45.3%	44.7%	34.1%	21.4%	35.5%	35.4%	10.7%
2	5	354	1.50	62.5%	63.2%	47.3%	29.0%	51.7%	22.3%	9.6%
3	6	554	1.55	65.5%	63.7%	55.4%	45.8%	39.8%	21.3%	9.4%
4	6	643	1.87	87.5%	89.1%	78.2%	43.1%	43.2%	25.7%	19.4%
5	4	458	1.65	76.1%	76.2%	60.8%	50.0%	31.4%	35.4%	5.7%
6	6	202	1.89	83.7%	82.9%	72.5%	40.2%	52.0%	36.1%	3.0%
7	8	520	1.71	74.0%	72.5%	67.5%	64.3%	50.7%	19.3%	10.8%
8	5	349	1.67	74.6%	73.6%	53.6%	24.9%	57.0%	14.9%	14.6%
9	3	188	1.66	66.5%	62.2%	47.3%	49.6%	29.3%	30.9%	23.9%
10	4	425	1.79	75.9%	72.3%	73.8%	50.7%	41.4%	18.1%	13.6%
11	4	148	1.41	48.5%	46.7%	29.7%	16.2%	40.3%	16.8%	12.8%
12	6	394	1.75	77.3%	73.1%	58.4%	25.3%	41.1%	34.8%	7.9%
15	6	166	1.65	57.9%	60.6%	58.3%	54.5%	39.8%	31.9%	15.1%
16	5	582	1.61	63.3%	63.7%	43.1%	19.9%	43.0%	32.5%	11.3%
17	6	838	1.54	44.4%	41.0%	39.7%	35.9%	25.4%	30.9%	24.9%
18	4	209	1.61	63.7%	60.2%	45.6%	46.2%	37.8%	24.4%	17.7%
19	3	42	1.63	35.7%	31.8%	48.6%	16.7%	47.6%	9.5%	19.0%
20	6	343	1.67	67.5%	67.0%	57.1%	61.8%	45.0%	25.1%	9.1%
21	4	164	1.44	49.6%	46.3%	36.1%	26.8%	29.9%	26.2%	16.5%
22	5	175	1.77	77.7%	76.1%	63.6%	52.5%	39.4%	10.9%	9.1%
23	8	421	1.73	74.6%	68.5%	60.2%	51.6%	39.2%	38.2%	6.2%
<b>VISN Average</b>			<b>1.64</b>	<b>65.3%</b>	<b>63.6%</b>	<b>53.9%</b>	<b>39.3%</b>	<b>41.0%</b>	<b>25.7%</b>	<b>12.9%</b>
<b>VISN SD</b>			<b>0.14</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>
<b>Veteran Average</b>			<b>1.63</b>	<b>65.9%</b>	<b>64.5%</b>	<b>52.7%</b>	<b>39.4%</b>	<b>40.1%</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>

† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

†† Only veterans with a problem in this area were included.

**Table 8b. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of VISN: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY03 †**

<b>VISN Median Value</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>65.5%</b>	<b>63.7%</b>	<b>55.4%</b>	<b>45.8%</b>	<b>43.0%</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>11.3%</b>
<b>Veteran Average</b>	<b>1.64</b>	<b>65.9%</b>	<b>64.5%</b>	<b>52.7%</b>	<b>39.4%</b>	<b>40.2%</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>

VISN††			AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
VISN	#SITES	# VETS								
1	7	676	-0.23	-20.9%	-10.5%	-20.9%	-17.5%	-1.7%	9.3%	-0.2%
2	5	354	-0.14	-6.5%	-1.2%	-6.3%	-10.3%	10.3%	-2.8%	-1.5%
3	6	554	-0.09	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-1.8%	-4.5%	-2.7%
4	6	643	0.24	24.3%	34.2%	28.4%	4.7%	0.1%	-0.4%	7.1%
5	4	458	0.01	10.0%	16.9%	5.2%	8.4%	-9.7%	9.8%	-6.2%
6	6	202	0.24	19.0%	22.5%	28.0%	-2.8%	8.7%	9.8%	-9.3%
7	8	520	0.08	8.9%	10.9%	19.0%	25.4%	8.9%	-6.1%	-1.3%
8	5	349	0.00	6.0%	11.1%	-3.7%	-24.8%	11.3%	-10.7%	3.0%
9	3	188	0.00	0.1%	-4.3%	-6.2%	5.9%	-15.0%	5.2%	12.8%
10	4	425	0.17	17.3%	18.0%	30.6%	16.0%	0.3%	-7.4%	2.1%
11	4	148	-0.15	-19.6%	-16.3%	-25.4%	-19.7%	2.0%	-8.9%	0.6%
12	6	394	0.09	4.9%	4.0%	-4.8%	-19.7%	-1.2%	9.3%	-3.7%
15	6	166	0.00	-11.7%	-1.2%	5.7%	11.1%	-2.4%	5.5%	4.1%
16	5	582	-0.03	-18.8%	-12.7%	-16.5%	-24.6%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%
17	6	838	-0.06	-16.1%	-17.2%	-11.0%	-1.2%	-14.4%	3.9%	12.3%
18	4	209	-0.03	-21.5%	-12.4%	-22.3%	0.8%	-4.5%	-0.4%	8.3%
19	3	42	0.02	-51.3%	-22.8%	-0.9%	-16.9%	7.9%	-16.5%	8.3%
20	6	343	0.01	-2.2%	7.4%	3.8%	19.0%	0.2%	0.0%	-0.4%
21	4	164	-0.16	-23.6%	-15.6%	-24.2%	-18.0%	-5.9%	1.3%	6.2%
22	5	175	0.19	16.5%	17.5%	17.8%	12.7%	3.4%	-13.0%	-1.1%
23	8	421	0.11	6.5%	14.6%	17.1%	14.8%	0.0%	13.1%	-4.5%

† Outcomes have been adjusted for the following veteran characteristics: Age, race, gender, previous employment history, residential history, receipt of disability

†† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

††† Only veterans with a problem in this area were included.

**Table 9. Summary of Outliers by VISN for FY03 †**

VISN	Number of Sites in VISN ††	Number of Veterans in VISN †††	VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
1	7	676	0	1	6	7
2	5	354	0	1	2	3
3	6	554	0	0	1	1
4	6	643	0	0	1	1
5	4	458	0	0	2	2
6	6	202	1	0	1	2
7	8	520	0	1	0	1
8	5	349	1	0	1	2
9	3	188	0	2	2	4
10	4	425	0	1	0	1
11	4	148	0	0	5	5
12	6	394	0	1	2	3
15	6	166	0	2	0	2
16	5	582	1	0	5	6
17	6	838	0	2	6	8
18	4	209	0	1	3	4
19	3	42	0	0	1	1
20	6	343	0	0	0	0
21	4	164	0	0	6	6
22	5	175	0	0	0	0
23	8	421	0	0	1	1
<b>VISN AVG</b>			<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.9</b>
<b>VISN SD</b>			<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

†† Includes all sites for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms on veterans discharged during FY03.

††† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

**Table 10. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY03**

VISN		SITE	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY03 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY03 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY03 for which Monitoring Data were Collected † %
1	405	White River Junction	18	18	0	100.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	463	-184	60.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	39	-14	64.1%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	107	-22	79.4%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	149	-36	75.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	81	-30	63.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	120	-15	87.5%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	75	-4	94.7%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	66	-12	81.8%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	76	-10	86.8%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	42	4	109.5%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	117	0	100.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	142	-2	98.6%
3	561	East Orange, NJ	19	17	2	111.8%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	290	-135	53.4%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	138	1	100.7%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	59	-2	96.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	89	-45	49.4%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	45	-18	60.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	364	-66	81.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	92	1	101.1%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA ††	0	0	0	closed ††
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	218	-21	90.4%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA †††	28	3	25	933.3%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	35	-1	97.1%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	157	0	100.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	144	5	103.5%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	122	-4	96.7%
6	558	Durham, NC	0	0	0	closed
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	145	-54	62.8%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	17	0	100.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	16	1	106.3%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	79	-2	97.5%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	0	2	-2	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	117	-3	97.4%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	48	1	102.1%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	58	-7	87.9%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	63	-4	93.7%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	51	-2	96.1%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	32	2	106.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	85	-19	77.6%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	141	-43	69.5%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	77	3	103.9%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	53	-1	98.1%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	38	21	155.3%
8	573	Gainesville, FL	68	43	25	158.1%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	138	-48	65.2%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	37	0	100.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	97	0	100.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	82	-28	65.9%

**Table 10 cont. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY03**

VISN		SITE	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY03 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY03 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY03 for which Monitoring Data were Collected † %
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	183	-42	77.0%
10	539	Cinninati, OH	168	166	2	101.2%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	98	1	101.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	24	-7	70.8%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	23	-10	56.5%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	79	-40	<b>49.4%</b>
11	550	Danville, IL	31	49	-18	63.3%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	66	-1	98.5%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	175	6	103.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	99	-8	91.9%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	0	0	0	closed
12	607	Madison, WI	16	17	-1	94.1%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	68	-21	69.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	58	1	101.7%
15	543	Columbia, MO	4	14	-10	<b>28.6%</b>
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	94	-3	96.8%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	31	-4	87.1%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	41	0	100.0%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	2	2	0	100.0%
15	657	St.Louis, MO	1	29	-28	<b>3.4%</b>
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	179	2	101.1%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	184	2	101.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	37	3	108.1%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	134	0	100.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	93	-52	<b>44.1%</b>
17	549	Dallas, TX ††††	385	485	11	102.3%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	43	-9	79.1%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX ††††	111	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	27	24	188.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	274	-17	93.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	96	-2	97.9%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	61	-5	91.8%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	61	-5	91.8%
18	756	El Paso, TX	3	3	0	100.0%
19	567GB	Colorado Springs, CO	10	9	1	111.1%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	21	0	100.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	16	-5	68.8%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	30	-3	90.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	104	-16	84.6%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR †††††	10	13	-3	76.9%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	115	-31	73.0%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	11	1	109.1%
20	692	White City, OR	122	123	-1	99.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	12	-2	83.3%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	68	0	100.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	16	0	100.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	75	-5	93.3%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	35	-4	88.6%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	72	1	101.4%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	21	21	200.0%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	173	-144	<b>16.8%</b>
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	0	14	-14	<b>0.0%</b>

**Table 10 cont. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY03**

		# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY03 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY03 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY03 for which Monitoring Data were Collected †† %
VISN	SITE				
23 437	Fargo, ND	2	2	0	100.0%
23 438	Sioux Falls, SD	0	0	0	closed
23 568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	43	-9	79.1%
23 568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	81	0	100.0%
23 618	Minneapolis, MN	36	15	21	240.0%
23 636A6	Des Moines, IA	0	0		closed
23 636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	64	-52	<b>18.8%</b>
23 656	St. Cloud, MN	256	245	11	104.5%
<b>Total</b>		<b>7,851</b>	<b>9,058</b>	<b>-1,207</b>	<b>86.7%</b>
<b>Site Average</b>		<b>71</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>89.5%</b>
<b>Site S.D.</b>		<b>69</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>33.7%</b>

† A percentage greater than 100% indicates a site that reported more discharges to NEPEC than to VAHQ.

†† No discharges were reported for Philadelphia for FY03 because the program closed. It is scheduled to reopen during FY04.

††† Extreme values were omitted from calculation of mean and standard deviation.

†††† Discharges for Fort Worth are reported to VAHQ along with those of Dallas.

††††† Data from Eugene and Roseburg are combined.

**Table 11. Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Age	GENDER	
					% males	% females
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	46.9	100.0%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	47.0	97.8%	2.2%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	49.6	92.0%	8.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	46.8	96.4%	3.6%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	46.9	94.7%	5.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	50.7	90.2%	9.8%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	48.4	97.1%	2.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	47.6	93.0%	7.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	46.3	96.3%	3.7%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	45.8	100.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	47.8	100.0%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	46.9	97.4%	2.6%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	46.9	97.8%	2.2%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	48.0	100.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	46.5	95.5%	4.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	47.5	97.8%	2.2%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	46.4	94.7%	5.3%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	47.7	90.7%	9.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	44.8	100.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	46.1	97.3%	2.7%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	45.3	95.7%	4.3%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	46.2	95.9%	4.1%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	48.5	100.0%	0.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	47.1	88.2%	11.8%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	47.8	93.6%	6.4%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	48.6	98.0%	2.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	47.6	93.2%	6.8%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	46.7	92.3%	7.7%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	46.4	100.0%	0.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	49.4	94.1%	5.9%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	48.2	93.5%	6.5%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	46.6	77.9%	22.1%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	47.8	81.6%	18.4%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	47.4	82.4%	17.6%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	48.8	94.9%	5.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	45.7	93.9%	6.1%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	48.9	100.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	46.6	92.4%	7.6%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	48.6	98.0%	2.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	49.0	96.3%	3.8%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	46.2	100.0%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	47.0	100.0%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	47.8	92.5%	7.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	46.5	93.3%	6.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	47.8	97.3%	2.7%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	47.8	99.0%	1.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	48.0	96.3%	3.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	46.0	95.0%	5.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	46.7	96.4%	3.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	46.6	97.0%	3.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	48.9	88.2%	11.8%

**Table 11 cont. Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY03 †**

VISN			N	Mean Age	GENDER	
SITE					% males	% females
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	47.5	92.3%	7.7%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	46.0	94.9%	5.1%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	47.1	93.5%	6.5%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	48.6	93.8%	6.2%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	46.7	99.4%	0.6%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	47.7	95.6%	4.4%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	44.0	100.0%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	46.3	97.9%	2.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	48.9	94.8%	5.2%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	46.1	98.9%	1.1%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	48.1	96.3%	3.7%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	47.5	97.6%	2.4%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	48.3	95.6%	4.4%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	48.5	95.7%	4.3%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	48.2	92.5%	7.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	45.6	97.0%	3.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	47.3	92.7%	7.3%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	47.3	97.1%	2.9%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	48.4	100.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	49.1	90.9%	9.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	48.3	94.1%	5.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	46.2	95.3%	4.7%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	47.0	96.8%	3.2%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	49.6	96.4%	3.6%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	45.7	89.3%	10.7%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	44.1	81.8%	18.2%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	48.6	100.0%	0.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	54.1	100.0%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	45.4	88.9%	11.1%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	48.5	94.3%	5.7%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	47.6	90.0%	10.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	48.0	88.0%	12.0%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	49.6	83.3%	16.7%
20	692	White City, OR	122	48.0	100.0%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	51.8	100.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	46.2	89.7%	10.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	50.4	100.0%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	50.3	97.1%	2.9%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	50.6	87.1%	12.9%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	48.4	95.9%	4.1%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	49.5	95.2%	4.8%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	46.0	100.0%	0.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	49.2	97.1%	2.9%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	48.1	97.5%	2.5%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	48.9	94.4%	5.6%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	48.7	83.3%	16.7%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	47.6	98.8%	1.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				47.4	95.5%	4.5%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				47.6	94.9%	5.1%
SITE S.D.				1.6	4.7%	4.7%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 4, Philadelphia; VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 12. Ethnicity by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	White %	African American %	Hispanic %	Other %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	94.4%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	78.5%	16.7%	1.8%	2.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	56.0%	44.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	80.0%	16.5%	2.4%	1.2%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	67.3%	24.8%	6.2%	1.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	74.5%	13.7%	7.8%	3.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	63.8%	29.5%	4.8%	1.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	33.8%	62.0%	1.4%	2.8%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	40.7%	53.7%	3.7%	1.9%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	33.3%	63.6%	3.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	50.0%	39.1%	6.5%	4.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	41.4%	52.6%	3.4%	2.6%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	10.9%	66.4%	22.6%	0.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	10.5%	84.2%	0.0%	5.3%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	21.3%	71.6%	5.2%	1.9%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	28.8%	57.6%	11.5%	2.2%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	16.1%	58.9%	19.6%	5.4%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	65.9%	25.0%	6.8%	2.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	63.0%	37.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	24.6%	69.0%	3.4%	3.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	39.8%	57.0%	3.2%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD), PA	197	42.3%	55.6%	0.5%	1.5%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	71.4%	25.0%	3.6%	0.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	17.6%	79.4%	2.9%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	32.1%	64.7%	2.6%	0.6%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	31.5%	64.4%	2.7%	1.3%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	4.3%	93.1%	2.6%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	15.4%	83.5%	0.0%	1.1%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	47.1%	52.9%	0.0%	0.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	11.8%	88.2%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	37.7%	55.8%	3.9%	2.6%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	9.6%	88.6%	1.8%	0.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	18.4%	79.6%	2.0%	0.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	7.8%	86.3%	5.9%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	37.3%	59.3%	3.4%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	18.4%	79.6%	2.0%	0.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	27.3%	66.7%	0.0%	6.1%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	7.6%	86.4%	3.0%	3.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	33.7%	66.3%	0.0%	0.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	58.8%	40.0%	0.0%	1.3%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	32.7%	50.0%	11.5%	5.8%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	52.5%	39.0%	5.1%	3.4%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	49.3%	49.3%	0.0%	1.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	52.2%	37.8%	10.0%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	21.6%	73.0%	5.4%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	62.9%	37.1%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	46.3%	53.7%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	62.1%	30.7%	3.6%	3.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	37.7%	61.1%	1.2%	0.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	27.3%	72.7%	0.0%	0.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	35.3%	58.8%	5.9%	0.0%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	41.0%	41.0%	12.8%	5.1%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	54.8%	41.9%	3.2%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	41.5%	55.4%	1.5%	1.5%

**Table 12 cont. Ethnicity by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE		N	White %	African American %	Hispanic %	Other %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	29.3%	70.2%	0.6%	0.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	26.4%	71.4%	1.1%	1.1%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	64.7%	23.5%	5.9%	5.9%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	70.2%	21.3%	2.1%	6.4%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	35.6%	59.3%	3.4%	1.7%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	39.6%	60.4%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	69.2%	26.9%	0.0%	3.8%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	39.0%	53.7%	2.4%	4.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	57.5%	40.9%	1.1%	0.6%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	25.4%	67.0%	6.5%	1.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	22.5%	77.5%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	34.3%	65.7%	0.0%	0.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	46.3%	36.6%	7.3%	9.8%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	22.1%	73.7%	2.6%	1.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	32.4%	64.7%	2.9%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	41.4%	54.1%	4.5%	0.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	49.0%	21.6%	27.5%	2.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	50.0%	39.4%	8.7%	2.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	50.0%	17.0%	31.9%	1.1%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	85.5%	7.3%	5.5%	1.8%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	67.9%	19.6%	12.5%	0.0%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	81.8%	9.1%	9.1%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	85.7%	9.5%	0.0%	4.8%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	90.9%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	48.1%	37.0%	0.0%	14.8%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	67.8%	20.7%	4.6%	6.9%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	72.3%	22.9%	3.6%	1.2%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	83.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
20	692	White City, OR	122	69.7%	20.5%	6.6%	3.3%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	33.3%	11.1%	11.1%	44.4%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	50.0%	39.7%	5.9%	4.4%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	68.8%	18.8%	12.5%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	30.9%	39.7%	17.6%	11.8%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	41.9%	48.4%	3.2%	6.5%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	58.9%	21.9%	15.1%	4.1%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	54.8%	23.8%	14.3%	7.1%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	20.7%	58.6%	10.3%	10.3%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	41.2%	2.9%	2.9%	52.9%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	80.8%	7.7%	5.1%	6.4%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	58.3%	33.3%	8.3%	0.0%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	91.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	59.4%	33.1%	2.0%	5.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				42.6%	50.3%	4.7%	2.3%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				45.3%	44.6%	4.7%	3.4%
SITE S.D.				22.9%	24.8%	5.8%	7.3%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 4, Philadelphia; VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 13. Marital Status by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Married %	Separated, Widowed or Divorced %	Never Married %
1	405 White River Junction, VT	18	22.2%	50.0%	27.8%
1	518 Bedford, MA	279	7.2%	58.1%	34.7%
1	523 Boston, MA	25	4.0%	72.0%	24.0%
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	85	5.9%	60.0%	34.1%
1	631 Northampton, MA	113	9.7%	61.9%	28.3%
1	650 Providence, RI	51	7.8%	76.5%	15.7%
1	689 West Haven, CT	105	6.9%	60.8%	32.4%
2	528 Buffalo, NY	71	11.3%	49.3%	39.4%
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	54	20.4%	44.4%	35.2%
2	528A6 Bath, NY	66	1.5%	70.8%	27.7%
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	46	13.0%	54.3%	32.6%
2	528A8 Albany, NY	117	3.5%	62.3%	34.2%
3	526 Bronx, NY	140	13.7%	48.9%	37.4%
3	561 E. Orange, NJ	19	16.7%	38.9%	44.4%
3	561A4 Lyons, NJ	155	7.8%	49.7%	42.5%
3	620 Montrose, NY	139	6.5%	53.6%	39.9%
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	57	1.8%	56.1%	42.1%
3	632 Northport, NY	44	4.5%	65.9%	29.5%
4	529 Butler, PA	27	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
4	542 Coatesville, PA	298	7.8%	59.5%	32.8%
4	595 Lebanon, PA	93	3.2%	53.8%	43.0%
4	646A5 Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	7.1%	57.1%	35.7%
4	693 Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	3.6%	57.1%	39.3%
5	512 Baltimore, MD	34	6.3%	56.3%	37.5%
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	157	10.9%	62.8%	26.3%
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	149	11.4%	57.0%	31.5%
5	688 Washington, DC	118	15.3%	50.8%	33.9%
6	590 Hampton, VA	91	6.9%	59.8%	33.3%
6	637 Asheville, NC	17	0.0%	58.8%	41.2%
6	652 Richmond, VA	17	5.9%	52.9%	41.2%
6	658 Salem, VA	77	10.4%	61.0%	28.6%
7	508 Atlanta, GA	114	2.6%	71.9%	25.4%
7	509 Augusta, GA	49	10.6%	70.2%	19.1%
7	521 Birmingham, AL	51	10.0%	70.0%	20.0%
7	534 Charleston, SC	59	18.6%	47.5%	33.9%
7	544 Columbia, SC	49	4.2%	77.1%	18.8%
7	557 Dublin, GA	34	0.0%	72.7%	27.3%
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	66	13.6%	56.1%	30.3%
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	98	19.6%	59.8%	20.6%
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	80	6.3%	72.2%	21.5%
8	546 Miami, FL	52	7.7%	65.4%	26.9%
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	59	8.5%	66.1%	25.4%
8	573 Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	8.8%	70.6%	20.6%
8	673 Tampa, FL	90	14.0%	68.6%	17.4%
9	614 Memphis, TN	37	11.1%	63.9%	25.0%
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	97	5.2%	65.6%	29.2%
9	626A4 Murfreesboro, TN	54	13.7%	72.5%	13.7%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	141	7.1%	67.9%	25.0%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	168	7.7%	63.1%	29.2%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	99	3.0%	63.6%	33.3%
10	552 Dayton, OH	17	11.8%	64.7%	23.5%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	13	7.7%	53.8%	38.5%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	39	5.1%	66.7%	28.2%
11	550 Danville, IL	31	6.5%	61.3%	32.3%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	65	9.2%	63.1%	27.7%

**Table 13 cont. Marital Status by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Married %	Separated, Widowed or Divorced %	Never Married %
12	556 North Chicago, IL	181	6.1%	61.9%	32.0%
12	578 Hines, IL	91	7.7%	69.2%	23.1%
12	607 Madison, WI	16	29.4%	47.1%	23.5%
12	676 Tomah, WI	47	6.4%	66.0%	27.7%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	59	3.4%	55.9%	40.7%
15	589 Kansas City, MO	91	4.4%	79.1%	16.5%
15	589A5 Topeka, KS	27	3.7%	85.2%	11.1%
15	589A6 Leavenworth, KS	41	7.3%	75.6%	17.1%
16	520 Biloxi, MS	181	8.3%	73.5%	18.2%
16	580 Houston, TX	186	9.9%	62.6%	27.5%
16	586 Jackson, MS	40	17.5%	50.0%	32.5%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	134	3.0%	70.1%	26.9%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	41	7.3%	63.4%	29.3%
17	549 Dallas, TX	385	5.5%	67.7%	26.8%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	34	5.9%	76.5%	17.6%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	111	7.2%	69.4%	23.4%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	51	11.8%	62.7%	25.5%
17	674 Temple, TX	257	3.9%	69.8%	26.3%
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	94	13.0%	56.5%	30.4%
18	649 Prescott, AZ	56	10.7%	73.2%	16.1%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	56	17.9%	58.9%	23.2%
19	554GE Colorado Springs, CO	10	9.1%	81.8%	9.1%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	21	9.5%	71.4%	19.0%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	11	0.0%	88.9%	11.1%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	27	3.7%	59.3%	37.0%
20	648 Portland, OR	88	10.2%	76.1%	13.6%
20	653 Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	0.0%	70.0%	30.0%
20	663A4 American Lake, WA	84	9.6%	67.5%	22.9%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	12	8.3%	75.0%	16.7%
20	692 White City, OR	122	2.5%	67.2%	30.3%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	10	20.0%	70.0%	10.0%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	68	4.5%	55.2%	40.3%
21	654 Reno, NV	16	0.0%	73.3%	26.7%
21	662 San Francisco, CA	70	10.3%	50.0%	39.7%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	31	9.7%	67.7%	22.6%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	73	17.8%	60.3%	21.9%
22	664 San Diego, CA	42	11.9%	42.9%	45.2%
22	691 West LA, CA	29	6.9%	58.6%	34.5%
23	568 Ft. Meade, SD	34	8.8%	70.6%	20.6%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	81	3.8%	76.3%	20.0%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	36	11.1%	58.3%	30.6%
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	12	8.3%	66.7%	25.0%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	256	9.1%	54.3%	36.6%
<b>VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)</b>			<b>8.1%</b>	<b>62.7%</b>	<b>29.2%</b>
<b>SITE AVERAGE (N=98)</b>			<b>8.3%</b>	<b>62.2%</b>	<b>27.5%</b>
<b>SITE S.D.</b>			<b>5.4%</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 4, Philadelphia; VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 14. Educational History by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	< 12 Years %	12 Years %	> 12 Years %
1	405 White River Junction, VT	18	22.2%	50.0%	27.8%
1	518 Bedford, MA	279	8.2%	53.8%	38.0%
1	523 Boston, MA	25	4.0%	36.0%	60.0%
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	85	10.6%	47.1%	42.4%
1	631 Northampton, MA	113	8.0%	60.2%	31.9%
1	650 Providence, RI	51	19.6%	45.1%	35.3%
1	689 West Haven, CT	105	8.6%	56.2%	35.2%
2	528 Buffalo, NY	71	7.0%	43.7%	49.3%
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	54	9.3%	61.1%	29.6%
2	528A6 Bath, NY	66	7.6%	62.1%	30.3%
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	46	15.2%	43.5%	41.3%
2	528A8 Albany, NY	117	5.1%	53.0%	41.9%
3	526 Bronx, NY	140	7.2%	46.0%	46.8%
3	561 E. Orange, NJ	19	15.8%	42.1%	42.1%
3	561A4 Lyons, NJ	155	11.0%	50.3%	38.7%
3	620 Montrose, NY	139	5.8%	58.3%	36.0%
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	57	8.8%	49.1%	42.1%
3	632 Northport, NY	44	2.3%	50.0%	47.7%
4	529 Butler, PA	27	3.7%	66.7%	29.6%
4	542 Coatesville, PA	298	10.1%	55.4%	34.6%
4	595 Lebanon, PA	93	2.2%	68.8%	29.0%
4	646A5 Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	5.1%	57.4%	37.6%
4	693 Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	3.6%	53.6%	42.9%
5	512 Baltimore, MD	34	5.9%	52.9%	41.2%
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	157	6.4%	51.0%	42.7%
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	149	16.8%	42.3%	40.9%
5	688 Washington, DC	118	7.6%	51.7%	40.7%
6	590 Hampton, VA	91	14.3%	58.2%	27.5%
6	637 Asheville, NC	17	0.0%	64.7%	35.3%
6	652 Richmond, VA	17	17.6%	41.2%	41.2%
6	658 Salem, VA	77	3.9%	58.4%	37.7%
7	508 Atlanta, GA	114	3.5%	54.4%	42.1%
7	509 Augusta, GA	49	0.0%	55.1%	44.9%
7	521 Birmingham, AL	51	5.9%	47.1%	47.1%
7	534 Charleston, SC	59	8.5%	64.4%	27.1%
7	544 Columbia, SC	49	4.1%	40.8%	55.1%
7	557 Dublin, GA	34	21.2%	30.3%	48.5%
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	66	4.5%	50.0%	45.5%
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	98	12.2%	44.9%	42.9%
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	80	5.0%	51.3%	43.8%
8	546 Miami, FL	52	7.7%	46.2%	46.2%
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	59	5.1%	62.7%	32.2%
8	573 Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	11.8%	50.0%	38.2%
8	673 Tampa, FL	90	1.1%	50.0%	48.9%
9	614 Memphis, TN	37	2.7%	67.6%	29.7%
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	97	9.3%	54.6%	36.1%
9	626A4 Murfreesboro, TN	54	13.0%	55.6%	31.5%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	141	7.1%	51.1%	41.8%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	168	3.6%	60.1%	36.3%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	99	11.1%	56.6%	32.3%
10	552 Dayton, OH	17	17.6%	52.9%	29.4%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	13	7.7%	30.8%	61.5%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	39	5.1%	56.4%	38.5%
11	550 Danville, IL	31	9.7%	29.0%	61.3%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	65	15.4%	49.2%	35.4%

**Table 14 cont. Educational History by Site for FY03 †**

VISN			SITE	N	< 12 Years %	12 Years %	> 12 Years %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI		13	7.7%	30.8%	61.5%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI		39	5.1%	56.4%	38.5%
11	550	Danville, IL		31	9.7%	29.0%	61.3%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN		65	15.4%	49.2%	35.4%
12	556	North Chicago, IL		181	3.3%	53.0%	43.6%
12	578	Hines, IL		91	4.4%	38.5%	57.1%
12	607	Madison, WI		16	0.0%	41.2%	58.8%
12	676	Tomah, WI		47	6.4%	42.6%	51.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI		59	22.0%	49.2%	28.8%
15	589	Kansas City, MO		91	2.2%	52.7%	45.1%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS		27	3.7%	44.4%	51.9%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS		41	12.2%	61.0%	26.8%
16	520	Biloxi, MS		181	6.1%	40.3%	53.6%
16	580	Houston, TX		186	5.4%	54.3%	40.3%
16	586	Jackson, MS		40	2.5%	40.0%	57.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR		134	7.5%	53.0%	39.6%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK		41	2.4%	41.5%	56.1%
17	549	Dallas, TX		385	5.5%	58.2%	36.4%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX		34	8.8%	52.9%	38.2%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX		111	11.7%	55.0%	33.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX		51	5.9%	37.3%	56.9%
17	674	Temple, TX		257	7.0%	43.2%	49.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM		94	3.2%	28.7%	68.1%
18	649	Prescott, AZ		56	5.4%	44.6%	50.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ		56	7.1%	39.3%	53.6%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO		10	9.1%	18.2%	72.7%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT		21	9.5%	47.6%	42.9%
19	666	Sheridan, WY		11	9.1%	81.8%	9.1%
20	463	Anchorage, AK		27	11.1%	37.0%	51.9%
20	648	Portland, OR		88	4.5%	50.0%	45.5%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR		10	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA		84	2.4%	34.9%	62.7%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA		12	0.0%	58.3%	41.7%
20	692	White City, OR		122	6.6%	51.6%	41.8%
21	459	Honolulu, HI		10	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA		68	8.8%	54.4%	36.8%
21	654	Reno, NV		16	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%
21	662	San Francisco, CA		70	7.1%	40.0%	52.9%
22	600	Long Beach, CA		31	3.2%	35.5%	61.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA		73	2.7%	39.7%	57.5%
22	664	San Diego, CA		42	9.5%	35.7%	54.8%
22	691	West LA, CA		29	3.4%	41.4%	55.2%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD		34	11.8%	32.4%	55.9%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD		81	0.0%	58.0%	42.0%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN		36	5.6%	36.1%	58.3%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA		12	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN		256	8.2%	48.4%	43.4%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)					7.3%	50.7%	42.0%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)					7.4%	49.3%	43.3%
SITE S.D.					5.1%	10.5%	10.9%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 15. Military Service Era by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	Persian Gulf %	Post-Vietnam %	Vietnam %	Pre-Vietnam %	Korean %	All Other Service Eras %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	11.1%	38.9%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	5.7%	45.9%	43.0%	4.3%	1.1%	0.0%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	0.0%	48.0%	48.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	11.9%	41.7%	42.9%	2.4%	1.2%	0.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	7.1%	43.4%	47.8%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	5.9%	21.6%	60.8%	7.8%	3.9%	0.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	7.6%	39.0%	47.6%	3.8%	1.0%	1.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	1.4%	57.1%	37.1%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	3.7%	63.0%	27.8%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	1.5%	65.2%	31.8%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	2.2%	50.0%	45.7%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	5.1%	52.1%	39.3%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	5.0%	59.0%	32.4%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	0.0%	47.4%	52.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	7.4%	54.1%	37.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	5.1%	51.1%	41.6%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	3.6%	53.6%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	14.0%	39.5%	41.9%	2.3%	0.0%	2.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	11.1%	66.7%	18.5%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	7.7%	51.0%	39.6%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	11.8%	53.8%	34.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	2.5%	54.8%	38.1%	4.1%	0.5%	0.0%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	3.6%	46.4%	46.4%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	2.9%	58.8%	35.3%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	7.1%	46.2%	41.7%	4.5%	0.6%	0.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	5.4%	37.6%	54.4%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	2.5%	52.5%	44.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	11.0%	50.5%	37.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	5.9%	47.1%	47.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	0.0%	23.5%	76.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	7.8%	42.9%	45.5%	2.6%	1.3%	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	6.1%	56.1%	35.1%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	0.0%	55.3%	44.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	5.9%	49.0%	45.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	1.7%	39.0%	55.9%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	10.2%	59.2%	28.6%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	0.0%	45.5%	51.5%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	10.6%	50.0%	34.8%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	5.1%	44.9%	44.9%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	3.8%	43.8%	45.0%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	7.7%	59.6%	32.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	8.6%	44.8%	44.8%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	8.8%	47.1%	39.7%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	12.2%	45.6%	42.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	2.7%	37.8%	59.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	5.2%	51.5%	36.1%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	5.6%	38.9%	51.9%	1.9%	1.9%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	12.8%	44.0%	40.4%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	7.1%	53.0%	38.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	2.0%	49.5%	47.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	5.9%	35.3%	52.9%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table 15 cont. Military Service Era by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Persian Gulf %	Post-Vietnam %	Vietnam %	Pre-Vietnam %	Korean %	All Other Service Eras %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	7.7%	53.8%	30.8%	7.7%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	7.7%	61.5%	30.8%	0.0%	0.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	6.5%	41.9%	51.6%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	7.7%	33.8%	53.8%	4.6%	0.0%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	4.4%	53.0%	39.8%	2.8%	0.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	6.6%	38.5%	51.6%	3.3%	0.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	5.9%	70.6%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	6.4%	46.8%	44.7%	2.1%	0.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	3.4%	37.3%	50.8%	8.5%	0.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	6.6%	53.8%	38.5%	1.1%	0.0%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	0.0%	25.9%	74.1%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	0.0%	43.9%	56.1%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	8.8%	39.2%	46.4%	5.5%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	3.8%	42.5%	50.0%	3.2%	0.0%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	12.5%	32.5%	50.0%	5.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	11.2%	48.5%	39.6%	0.7%	0.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	4.9%	39.0%	51.2%	4.9%	0.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	5.7%	50.0%	41.4%	2.6%	0.0%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	2.9%	47.1%	47.1%	2.9%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	7.2%	35.1%	53.2%	4.5%	0.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	7.8%	43.1%	39.2%	7.8%	2.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	9.8%	55.7%	33.3%	1.2%	0.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	5.3%	47.9%	41.5%	5.3%	0.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	3.6%	28.6%	62.5%	5.4%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	5.4%	58.9%	33.9%	1.8%	0.0%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	27.3%	36.4%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	4.8%	52.4%	38.1%	4.8%	0.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	0.0%	27.3%	54.5%	18.2%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	3.7%	77.8%	18.5%	0.0%	0.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	8.0%	35.2%	53.4%	3.4%	0.0%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	10.0%	30.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	9.8%	34.1%	52.4%	3.7%	0.0%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	8.3%	25.0%	50.0%	16.7%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	122	3.3%	37.7%	54.9%	4.1%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	4.4%	60.3%	33.8%	1.5%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	0.0%	18.8%	75.0%	6.3%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	5.7%	34.3%	48.6%	10.0%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	9.7%	19.4%	58.1%	9.7%	3.2%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	9.6%	34.2%	53.4%	2.7%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	7.1%	40.5%	42.9%	4.8%	0.0%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	0.0%	55.2%	44.8%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	9.1%	33.3%	48.5%	6.1%	0.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	3.8%	33.3%	61.5%	0.0%	1.3%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	2.8%	41.7%	52.8%	2.8%	0.0%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	6.7%	48.6%	38.4%	3.5%	2.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				<b>6.3%</b>	<b>47.0%</b>	<b>43.3%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				<b>6.0%</b>	<b>45.2%</b>	<b>45.1%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
SITE S.D.				<b>4.1%</b>	<b>11.2%</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03:

VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 16. Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	VA Inpatient %	VA Outpatient %	VA Domiciliary %	Non-VA Health Care %	Self- Referred %	Vet Center %	Other %
1	405 White River Junction, VT	18	22.2%	55.6%	0.0%	5.6%	11.1%	5.6%	0.0%
1	518 Bedford, MA	279	9.7%	25.8%	35.1%	1.8%	16.1%	1.1%	10.4%
1	523 Boston, MA	25	27.3%	40.9%	22.7%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	85	25.9%	7.1%	64.7%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
1	631 Northampton, MA	113	15.9%	23.9%	1.8%	28.3%	24.8%	4.4%	0.9%
1	650 Providence, RI	51	15.7%	47.1%	9.8%	15.7%	7.8%	3.9%	0.0%
1	689 West Haven, CT	105	1.9%	86.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	1.9%	1.9%
2	528 Buffalo, NY	71	0.0%	97.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	54	1.9%	0.0%	55.6%	11.1%	18.5%	9.3%	3.7%
2	528A6 Bath, NY	66	3.0%	0.0%	97.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	46	4.3%	65.2%	17.4%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A8 Albany, NY	117	4.3%	26.5%	29.9%	6.0%	31.6%	0.9%	0.9%
3	526 Bronx, NY	140	0.0%	84.9%	0.7%	1.4%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561 E. Orange, NJ	19	0.0%	89.5%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4 Lyons, NJ	155	1.3%	0.0%	96.8%	0.0%	0.6%	1.3%	0.0%
3	620 Montrose, NY	139	1.4%	5.0%	93.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	57	1.8%	59.6%	28.1%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	5.3%
3	632 Northport, NY	44	2.3%	86.4%	11.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	529 Butler, PA	27	0.0%	7.4%	92.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542 Coatesville, PA	298	0.7%	5.0%	94.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
4	595 Lebanon, PA	93	83.9%	12.9%	1.1%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5 Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	1.0%	36.0%	51.3%	1.5%	2.0%	6.6%	1.5%
4	693 Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	50.0%	7.1%	0.0%	21.4%	7.1%	0.0%	14.3%
5	512 Baltimore, MD	34	0.0%	88.2%	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	157	76.4%	6.4%	15.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	149	0.0%	6.0%	85.2%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688 Washington, DC	118	0.8%	81.4%	10.2%	1.7%	0.0%	3.4%	2.5%
6	590 Hampton, VA	91	5.5%	0.0%	93.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637 Asheville, NC	17	35.3%	52.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%
6	652 Richmond, VA	17	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658 Salem, VA	77	20.8%	3.9%	1.3%	2.6%	3.9%	0.0%	67.5%
7	508 Atlanta, GA	114	0.0%	86.8%	0.0%	1.8%	7.9%	3.5%	0.0%
7	509 Augusta, GA	49	6.1%	67.3%	12.2%	0.0%	12.2%	0.0%	2.0%
7	521 Birmingham, AL	51	2.0%	90.2%	0.0%	2.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534 Charleston, SC	59	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	544 Columbia, SC	49	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	557 Dublin, GA	34	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	66	1.5%	21.2%	69.7%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	1.5%
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	98	4.1%	71.4%	0.0%	0.0%	22.4%	0.0%	2.0%
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	80	31.3%	8.8%	43.8%	0.0%	15.0%	0.0%	1.3%
8	546 Miami, FL	52	42.3%	55.8%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	59	11.9%	66.1%	0.0%	5.1%	8.5%	0.0%	8.5%
8	573 Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	2.9%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	41.2%
8	673 Tampa, FL	90	0.0%	93.3%	0.0%	3.3%	2.2%	0.0%	1.1%
9	614 Memphis, TN	37	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	97	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4 Murfreesboro, TN	54	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	141	10.6%	68.1%	17.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	168	0.0%	22.6%	51.2%	7.7%	14.9%	0.0%	3.6%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	99	0.0%	35.4%	64.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	552 Dayton, OH	17	47.1%	29.4%	11.8%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Table 16 cont. Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY03 †**

VISN			N	VA Inpatient %	VA Outpatient %	VA Domiciliary %	Non-VA Health Care %	Self- Referred %	Vet Center %	Other %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	7.7%	76.9%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	66.7%	25.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	0.0%	69.2%	0.0%	7.7%	6.2%	0.0%	16.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	12.2%	11.6%	72.4%	1.1%	2.2%	0.0%	0.6%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	27.5%	70.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	0.0%	47.1%	0.0%	5.9%	11.8%	0.0%	35.3%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	0.0%	72.3%	0.0%	6.4%	6.4%	0.0%	14.9%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	5.1%	5.1%	64.4%	3.4%	10.2%	8.5%	3.4%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	53.3%	45.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	18.5%	55.6%	3.7%	0.0%	18.5%	0.0%	3.7%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	6.1%	9.9%	82.3%	0.0%	0.6%	1.1%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	1.6%	96.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.6%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	12.5%	62.5%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	0.0%	19.4%	56.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.6%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	4.9%	95.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	8.1%	65.5%	0.3%	0.5%	23.9%	0.5%	1.3%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	0.0%	2.9%	97.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	1.8%	0.9%	1.8%	3.6%	88.3%	3.6%	0.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	0.0%	92.2%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	3.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	16.7%	10.1%	39.7%	5.1%	22.2%	4.3%	1.9%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	39.4%	23.4%	1.1%	4.3%	30.9%	0.0%	1.1%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	0.0%	3.6%	67.9%	7.1%	16.1%	1.8%	3.6%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	1.8%	78.6%	0.0%	1.8%	17.9%	0.0%	0.0%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	0.0%	81.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	4.8%	85.7%	0.0%	4.8%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	18.2%	27.3%	0.0%	36.4%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	0.0%	3.7%	74.1%	3.7%	14.8%	0.0%	3.7%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	1.1%	68.2%	1.1%	2.3%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	20.5%	34.9%	16.9%	4.8%	14.5%	8.4%	0.0%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	122	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	13.2%	11.8%	48.5%	5.9%	10.3%	2.9%	7.4%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%	0.0%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	2.9%	70.0%	0.0%	10.0%	15.7%	1.4%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	3.2%	93.5%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	9.5%	69.0%	0.0%	16.7%	2.4%	0.0%	2.4%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	3.4%	72.4%	10.3%	10.3%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	26.5%	17.6%	8.8%	2.9%	41.2%	2.9%	0.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	0.0%	0.0%	96.3%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	22.2%	33.3%	8.3%	25.0%	8.3%	2.8%	0.0%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	0.0%	58.3%	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	14.5%	12.9%	65.6%	0.8%	4.3%	2.0%	0.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				10.3%	40.3%	33.5%	2.6%	9.1%	1.1%	3.2%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				11.1%	46.4%	24.5%	3.2%	8.4%	1.1%	3.3%
SITE S.D.				17.9%	35.5%	34.3%	6.2%	13.5%	2.6%	9.2%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 17. Usual Employment Pattern during the Three Years Prior to Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN SITE			N	Usually Employed or in a Constructive Activity†† %	Retired or Disabled %	Usually Unemployed %	Other %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	33.3%	16.7%	44.4%	5.6%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	64.9%	7.6%	20.3%	7.2%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	76.0%	8.0%	4.0%	12.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	72.9%	4.7%	17.6%	4.7%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	81.1%	1.8%	17.1%	0.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	58.8%	15.7%	21.6%	3.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	65.7%	13.1%	18.2%	3.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	60.0%	7.1%	31.4%	1.4%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	87.0%	3.7%	9.3%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	77.3%	1.5%	19.7%	1.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	71.7%	4.3%	19.6%	4.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	72.2%	5.2%	18.3%	4.3%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	38.4%	1.4%	58.7%	1.4%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	77.8%	0.0%	11.1%	11.1%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	90.3%	0.0%	5.8%	3.9%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	69.1%	1.5%	25.7%	3.7%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	41.8%	1.8%	54.5%	1.8%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	61.4%	4.5%	31.8%	2.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	85.2%	3.7%	11.1%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	80.5%	1.7%	12.3%	5.5%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	64.5%	3.2%	32.3%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	81.1%	3.6%	9.2%	6.1%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	82.1%	3.6%	14.3%	0.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	76.5%	2.9%	20.6%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	81.9%	3.9%	12.9%	1.3%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	77.9%	8.7%	12.8%	0.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	73.7%	0.0%	25.4%	0.8%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	90.0%	2.2%	6.7%	1.1%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	88.2%	0.0%	5.9%	5.9%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	76.5%	0.0%	23.5%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	78.9%	9.2%	11.8%	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	89.4%	0.0%	8.8%	1.8%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	72.9%	12.5%	14.6%	0.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	84.0%	8.0%	6.0%	2.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	79.7%	10.2%	10.2%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	75.5%	2.0%	18.4%	4.1%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	97.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	90.5%	3.2%	4.8%	1.6%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	69.4%	8.2%	18.4%	4.1%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	85.0%	3.8%	11.3%	0.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	80.8%	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	79.7%	0.0%	18.6%	1.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	77.6%	6.0%	13.4%	3.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	97.7%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	73.0%	2.7%	16.2%	8.1%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	88.7%	2.1%	9.3%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	83.3%	11.1%	0.0%	5.6%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	71.6%	12.1%	7.8%	8.5%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	80.7%	12.7%	6.0%	0.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	66.7%	1.0%	27.3%	5.1%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	76.5%	0.0%	11.8%	11.8%

**Table 17 cont. Usual Employment Pattern during the Three Years Prior to Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN			SITE	N	Usually Employed or in a Constructive Activity†† %	Retired or Disabled %	Usually Unemployed %	Other %
11	506		Ann Arbor, MI	13	84.6%	0.0%	7.7%	7.7%
11	515		Battle Creek, MI	39	84.6%	0.0%	12.8%	2.6%
11	550		Danville, IL	31	58.1%	16.1%	25.8%	0.0%
11	583		Indianapolis, IN	65	65.6%	7.8%	21.9%	4.7%
12	556		North Chicago, IL	181	86.1%	0.6%	12.2%	1.1%
12	578		Hines, IL	91	67.0%	7.7%	23.1%	2.2%
12	607		Madison, WI	16	58.8%	11.8%	23.5%	5.9%
12	676		Tomah, WI	47	80.9%	10.6%	8.5%	0.0%
12	695		Milwaukee, WI	59	63.8%	10.3%	19.0%	6.9%
15	589		Kansas City, MO	91	78.9%	4.4%	7.8%	8.9%
15	589A5		Topeka, KS	27	74.1%	3.7%	7.4%	14.8%
15	589A6		Leavenworth, KS	41	90.2%	0.0%	9.8%	0.0%
16	520		Biloxi, MS	181	83.4%	2.2%	12.2%	2.2%
16	580		Houston, TX	186	64.5%	4.3%	24.2%	7.0%
16	586		Jackson, MS	40	82.5%	5.0%	10.0%	2.5%
16	598		Little Rock, AR	134	73.1%	1.5%	25.4%	0.0%
16	635		Oklahoma City, OK	41	75.6%	2.4%	17.1%	4.9%
17	549		Dallas, TX	385	78.4%	5.0%	12.1%	4.5%
17	549A4		Bonham, TX	34	85.3%	2.9%	5.9%	5.9%
17	549BY		Fort Worth, TX	111	57.4%	14.8%	26.9%	0.9%
17	671		San Antonio, TX	51	86.3%	3.9%	3.9%	5.9%
17	674		Temple, TX	257	89.0%	1.2%	7.1%	2.7%
18	501		Albuquerque, NM	94	74.2%	6.5%	16.1%	3.2%
18	649		Prescott, AZ	56	76.8%	12.5%	10.7%	0.0%
18	678		Tucson, AZ	56	76.8%	0.0%	23.2%	0.0%
19	554GE		Colorado Springs, CO	10	70.0%	0.0%	20.0%	10.0%
19	660		Salt Lake City, UT	21	90.5%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%
19	666		Sheridan, WY	11	72.7%	9.1%	18.2%	0.0%
20	463		Anchorage, AK	27	81.5%	0.0%	7.4%	11.1%
20	648		Portland, OR	88	85.7%	1.2%	10.7%	2.4%
20	653		Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	80.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%
20	663A4		American Lake, WA	84	68.3%	1.2%	25.6%	4.9%
20	687		Walla Walla, WA	12	75.0%	8.3%	16.7%	0.0%
20	692		White City, OR	122	71.9%	1.7%	21.5%	5.0%
21	459		Honolulu, HI	10	70.0%	0.0%	20.0%	10.0%
21	640		Palo Alto, CA	68	60.3%	0.0%	38.2%	1.5%
21	654		Reno, NV	16	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%
21	662		San Francisco, CA	70	45.5%	16.7%	33.3%	4.5%
22	600		Long Beach, CA	31	61.3%	22.6%	16.1%	0.0%
22	605		Loma Linda, CA	73	76.7%	9.6%	12.3%	1.4%
22	664		San Diego, CA	42	54.8%	26.2%	19.0%	0.0%
22	691		West LA, CA	29	55.6%	0.0%	33.3%	11.1%
23	568		Ft. Meade, SD	34	67.6%	17.6%	14.7%	0.0%
23	568A4		Hot Springs, SD	81	68.8%	10.0%	17.5%	3.8%
23	618		Minneapolis, MN	36	69.4%	11.1%	13.9%	5.6%
23	636A7		Knoxville, IA	12	41.7%	33.3%	25.0%	0.0%
23	656		St. Cloud, MN	256	74.4%	14.0%	10.0%	1.6%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)					75.2%	5.4%	16.3%	3.2%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)					74.0%	6.0%	16.7%	3.3%
SITE S.D.					12.3%	7.0%	10.2%	3.5%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

†† Includes full- and part-time employment, student and/or volunteer.

**Table 18. Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	0 Days %	1-19 Days %	> 19 Days %	Mean Number of Days Worked for Pay #	Mean Employment Income Past 30 Days \$
1	405 White River Junction, VT	18	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	1.3	\$40.50
1	518 Bedford, MA	279	82.4%	15.1%	2.5%	1.7	\$86.37
1	523 Boston, MA	25	84.0%	8.0%	8.0%	2.6	\$289.60
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	85	98.8%	0.0%	1.2%	0.2	\$10.35
1	631 Northampton, MA	113	89.4%	7.1%	3.5%	1.3	\$45.18
1	650 Providence, RI	51	94.1%	3.9%	2.0%	0.8	\$28.43
1	689 West Haven, CT	105	92.4%	5.7%	1.9%	0.8	\$42.36
2	528 Buffalo, NY	71	95.8%	4.2%	0.0%	0.6	\$27.11
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	54	96.3%	1.9%	1.9%	0.7	\$31.48
2	528A6 Bath, NY	66	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	46	91.3%	2.2%	6.5%	1.7	\$66.83
2	528A8 Albany, NY	117	89.7%	6.8%	3.4%	1.3	\$31.96
3	526 Bronx, NY	140	95.7%	1.4%	2.9%	0.8	\$16.87
3	561 E. Orange, NJ	19	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
3	561A4 Lyons, NJ	155	93.5%	3.9%	2.6%	1.1	\$37.96
3	620 Montrose, NY	139	98.6%	0.0%	1.4%	0.4	\$0.93
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	57	98.2%	0.0%	1.8%	0.5	\$5.26
3	632 Northport, NY	44	90.9%	6.8%	2.3%	0.6	\$23.82
4	529 Butler, PA	27	96.3%	0.0%	3.7%	0.8	\$22.22
4	542 Coatesville, PA	298	94.6%	5.0%	0.3%	0.6	\$26.84
4	595 Lebanon, PA	93	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
4	646A5 Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	98.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.3	\$8.48
4	693 Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	78.6%	14.3%	7.1%	2.8	\$66.18
5	512 Baltimore, MD	34	94.1%	5.9%	0.0%	0.5	\$8.00
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	157	98.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.2	\$7.01
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	149	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
5	688 Washington, DC	118	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.85
6	590 Hampton, VA	91	95.6%	2.2%	2.2%	0.8	\$58.57
6	637 Asheville, NC	17	82.4%	11.8%	5.9%	1.5	\$51.76
6	652 Richmond, VA	17	76.5%	17.6%	5.9%	2.8	\$63.24
6	658 Salem, VA	77	85.7%	10.4%	3.9%	1.8	\$36.17
7	508 Atlanta, GA	114	79.8%	20.2%	0.0%	1.2	\$36.75
7	509 Augusta, GA	49	95.9%	4.1%	0.0%	0.3	\$6.69
7	521 Birmingham, AL	51	86.3%	7.8%	5.9%	2.0	\$52.55
7	534 Charleston, SC	59	88.1%	11.9%	0.0%	0.4	\$18.47
7	544 Columbia, SC	49	55.1%	24.5%	20.4%	7.2	\$197.41
7	557 Dublin, GA	34	97.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$3.18
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	66	98.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.2	\$0.79
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	98	91.8%	7.1%	1.0%	0.9	\$25.26
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	80	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
8	546 Miami, FL	52	76.9%	21.2%	1.9%	1.4	\$92.27
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	59	81.4%	16.9%	1.7%	1.9	\$83.73
8	573 Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	89.7%	10.3%	0.0%	0.7	\$31.62
8	673 Tampa, FL	90	95.6%	3.3%	1.1%	0.5	\$19.78
9	614 Memphis, TN	37	89.2%	10.8%	0.0%	0.3	\$8.11
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	97	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
9	626A4 Murfreesboro, TN	54	94.4%	5.6%	0.0%	0.3	\$14.44
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	141	87.9%	7.1%	5.0%	1.9	\$70.02
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	168	89.3%	8.9%	1.8%	1.2	\$43.23
10	541 Cleveland, OH	99	94.9%	4.0%	1.0%	0.5	\$24.37
10	552 Dayton, OH	17	94.1%	5.9%	0.0%	0.2	\$3.53

**Table 18 cont. Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	0 Days %	1-19 Days %	> 19 Days %	Mean Number of Days Worked for Pay #	Mean Employment Income Past 30 Days \$
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	13	92.3%	0.0%	7.7%	1.5	\$33.23
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	39	84.6%	12.8%	2.6%	1.6	\$55.13
11	550 Danville, IL	31	87.1%	6.5%	6.5%	2.4	\$82.06
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	65	80.0%	16.9%	3.1%	1.6	\$51.35
12	556 North Chicago, IL	181	98.3%	0.6%	1.1%	0.2	\$16.66
12	578 Hines, IL	91	93.4%	5.5%	1.1%	0.5	\$25.36
12	607 Madison, WI	16	76.5%	11.8%	11.8%	3.4	\$135.65
12	676 Tomah, WI	47	93.6%	4.3%	2.1%	0.6	\$36.51
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	59	91.5%	6.8%	1.7%	0.8	\$67.86
15	589 Kansas City, MO	91	94.5%	4.4%	1.1%	0.6	\$18.57
15	589A5 Topeka, KS	27	92.6%	7.4%	0.0%	0.5	\$6.48
15	589A6 Leavenworth, KS	41	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
16	520 Biloxi, MS	181	88.4%	9.4%	2.2%	1.3	\$68.23
16	580 Houston, TX	186	90.9%	4.8%	4.3%	1.5	\$42.25
16	586 Jackson, MS	40	60.0%	37.5%	2.5%	3.2	\$95.43
16	598 Little Rock, AR	134	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	41	95.1%	4.9%	0.0%	0.3	\$5.49
17	549 Dallas, TX	385	84.7%	14.5%	0.8%	1.3	\$50.53
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	34	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	111	59.5%	30.6%	9.9%	4.6	\$121.74
17	671 San Antonio, TX	51	76.5%	19.6%	3.9%	2.6	\$109.57
17	674 Temple, TX	257	82.5%	13.6%	3.9%	1.9	\$56.24
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	94	85.1%	13.8%	1.1%	1.3	\$46.85
18	649 Prescott, AZ	56	94.6%	5.4%	0.0%	0.4	\$12.50
18	678 Tucson, AZ	56	85.7%	5.4%	8.9%	2.3	\$96.75
19	554GE Colorado Springs, CO	10	90.9%	0.0%	9.1%	2.3	\$145.45
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	21	95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	0.8	\$28.57
19	666 Sheridan, WY	11	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
20	463 Anchorage, AK	27	92.6%	3.7%	3.7%	1.3	\$127.78
20	648 Portland, OR	88	85.2%	13.6%	1.1%	1.4	\$55.22
20	653 Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	90.0%	0.0%	10.0%	2.4	\$65.00
20	663A4 American Lake, WA	84	95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	0.4	\$12.59
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	12	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	1.5	\$45.25
20	692 White City, OR	122	97.5%	0.8%	1.6%	0.4	\$14.26
21	459 Honolulu, HI	10	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.2	\$8.00
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	68	94.1%	4.4%	1.5%	0.9	\$25.00
21	654 Reno, NV	16	93.8%	6.3%	0.0%	0.1	\$2.88
21	662 San Francisco, CA	70	94.3%	2.9%	2.9%	0.7	\$22.23
22	600 Long Beach, CA	31	61.3%	22.6%	16.1%	5.5	\$333.74
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	73	94.5%	4.1%	1.4%	0.7	\$29.82
22	664 San Diego, CA	42	95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	0.4	\$9.52
22	691 West LA, CA	29	89.7%	6.9%	3.4%	1.6	\$59.66
23	568 Ft. Meade, SD	34	85.3%	11.8%	2.9%	1.4	\$57.50
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	81	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	36	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	\$0.00
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	12	91.7%	0.0%	8.3%	1.7	\$25.00
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	256	88.7%	9.8%	1.6%	1.2	\$61.99
<b>VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)</b>			<b>90.8%</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>\$38.83</b>
<b>SITE AVERAGE (N=98)</b>			<b>90.3%</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>\$43.17</b>
<b>SITE S.D.</b>			<b>9.2%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>\$53.68</b>

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 19. Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	Prior CWT/VI Admission %	Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	16.7%	11.1%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	59.0%	44.6%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	80.0%	47.6%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	44.7%	87.1%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	52.7%	2.7%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	44.0%	45.1%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	21.2%	8.6%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	35.2%	1.4%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	37.0%	57.4%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	30.3%	98.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	60.9%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	52.6%	2.6%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	19.6%	0.7%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	36.8%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	34.4%	97.4%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	25.4%	77.7%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	38.6%	26.3%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	56.8%	0.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	18.5%	92.6%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	36.7%	95.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	31.2%	1.1%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	40.0%	46.2%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	28.6%	17.9%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	17.6%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	26.5%	91.1%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	30.9%	82.6%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	33.6%	1.7%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	15.4%	84.4%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	35.3%	0.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	41.2%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	37.7%	14.3%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	31.9%	2.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	38.3%	34.7%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	33.3%	3.9%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	22.0%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	6.3%	0.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	12.1%	100.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	20.3%	63.6%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	34.7%	2.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	25.0%	51.3%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	5.8%	30.8%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	20.3%	1.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	22.1%	4.4%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	16.7%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	27.0%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	12.6%	100.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	7.5%	3.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	37.6%	66.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	16.7%	60.1%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	17.3%	64.6%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	11.8%	41.2%

**Table 19 cont. Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Prior CWT/VI Admission %	Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit %
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	13	53.8%	0.0%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	39	25.6%	2.6%
11	550 Danville, IL	31	29.0%	6.5%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	65	37.5%	4.6%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	181	27.1%	83.4%
12	578 Hines, IL	91	40.7%	0.0%
12	607 Madison, WI	16	0.0%	0.0%
12	676 Tomah, WI	47	31.9%	80.9%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	59	33.9%	74.6%
15	589 Kansas City, MO	91	48.4%	9.9%
15	589A5 Topeka, KS	27	37.0%	3.7%
15	589A6 Leavenworth, KS	41	2.4%	100.0%
16	520 Biloxi, MS	181	16.0%	80.7%
16	580 Houston, TX	186	30.3%	1.6%
16	586 Jackson, MS	40	22.5%	0.0%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	134	26.1%	54.5%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	41	51.2%	0.0%
17	549 Dallas, TX	385	43.3%	7.0%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	34	11.8%	97.1%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	111	41.7%	2.7%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	51	3.9%	0.0%
17	674 Temple, TX	257	27.2%	87.5%
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	94	29.8%	39.4%
18	649 Prescott, AZ	56	25.0%	72.7%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	56	10.9%	0.0%
19	554GE Colorado Springs, CO	10	18.2%	9.1%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	21	0.0%	0.0%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	11	18.2%	0.0%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	27	25.9%	66.7%
20	648 Portland, OR	88	31.0%	1.1%
20	653 Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	40.0%	0.0%
20	663A4 American Lake, WA	84	26.5%	36.1%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	12	0.0%	0.0%
20	692 White City, OR	122	20.5%	100.0%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	10	30.0%	0.0%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	68	22.1%	50.7%
21	654 Reno, NV	16	56.3%	0.0%
21	662 San Francisco, CA	70	43.5%	1.4%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	31	22.6%	0.0%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	73	26.0%	0.0%
22	664 San Diego, CA	42	14.3%	0.0%
22	691 West LA, CA	29	31.0%	13.8%
23	568 Ft. Meade, SD	34	58.8%	2.9%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	81	28.4%	96.3%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	36	8.6%	13.9%
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	12	33.3%	41.7%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	256	44.9%	76.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)			31.5%	41.8%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)			29.2%	31.5%
SITE S.D.			14.9%	36.4%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 20. Veterans' Report of Public Financial Support at Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Service Connected for Psychiatry %	Service Connected for Other %	Non-Service Connected Pension %	Any VA Benefit %	Social Security Disability %	Any VA or Non-VA Disability %
1	405 White River Junction, VT	18	11.1%	16.7%	22.2%	44.4%	22.2%	38.9%
1	518 Bedford, MA	279	5.0%	14.0%	6.5%	23.3%	14.7%	30.8%
1	523 Boston, MA	25	0.0%	12.0%	0.0%	12.0%	12.0%	24.0%
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	85	8.2%	25.9%	7.1%	35.3%	7.1%	36.5%
1	631 Northampton, MA	113	14.2%	9.7%	0.0%	21.2%	10.6%	30.1%
1	650 Providence, RI	51	9.8%	7.8%	13.7%	29.4%	25.5%	37.3%
1	689 West Haven, CT	105	1.9%	10.5%	7.6%	20.0%	28.6%	39.0%
2	528 Buffalo, NY	71	9.9%	12.7%	2.8%	21.1%	5.6%	23.9%
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	54	3.7%	7.4%	1.9%	13.0%	3.7%	14.8%
2	528A6 Bath, NY	66	1.5%	10.6%	1.5%	13.6%	1.5%	13.6%
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	46	2.2%	23.9%	4.3%	30.4%	8.7%	32.6%
2	528A8 Albany, NY	117	6.9%	7.8%	3.4%	18.1%	12.9%	24.1%
3	526 Bronx, NY	140	2.9%	5.8%	5.0%	12.9%	5.0%	14.4%
3	561 E. Orange, NJ	19	10.5%	5.3%	10.5%	26.3%	10.5%	21.1%
3	561A4 Lyons, NJ	155	7.1%	11.6%	1.9%	18.7%	3.9%	19.4%
3	620 Montrose, NY	139	4.3%	7.9%	1.4%	13.7%	6.5%	15.8%
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	57	10.5%	17.5%	8.8%	35.1%	22.8%	45.6%
3	632 Northport, NY	44	6.8%	9.1%	0.0%	13.6%	9.1%	25.0%
4	529 Butler, PA	27	0.0%	7.4%	3.7%	11.1%	7.4%	11.1%
4	542 Coatesville, PA	298	1.3%	10.7%	1.3%	13.1%	1.3%	13.4%
4	595 Lebanon, PA	93	4.3%	10.8%	0.0%	14.0%	1.1%	15.1%
4	646A5 Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	3.0%	7.6%	3.6%	13.2%	3.6%	14.7%
4	693 Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	3.6%	7.1%	7.1%	17.9%	0.0%	10.7%
5	512 Baltimore, MD	34	2.9%	5.9%	8.8%	14.7%	17.6%	20.6%
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	157	1.3%	15.3%	2.5%	17.8%	8.3%	23.6%
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	149	5.4%	18.8%	6.0%	28.2%	2.7%	22.8%
5	688 Washington, DC	118	4.2%	10.2%	0.8%	14.4%	4.2%	16.9%
6	590 Hampton, VA	91	1.1%	16.5%	0.0%	17.6%	0.0%	17.6%
6	637 Asheville, NC	17	5.9%	11.8%	0.0%	17.6%	0.0%	17.6%
6	652 Richmond, VA	17	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	5.9%
6	658 Salem, VA	77	6.5%	14.3%	10.4%	27.3%	9.1%	23.4%
7	508 Atlanta, GA	114	0.0%	14.0%	0.0%	14.0%	1.8%	16.7%
7	509 Augusta, GA	49	4.1%	14.3%	12.2%	26.5%	10.2%	28.6%
7	521 Birmingham, AL	51	3.9%	5.9%	3.9%	11.8%	3.9%	11.8%
7	534 Charleston, SC	59	1.7%	15.3%	8.5%	25.4%	8.5%	27.1%
7	544 Columbia, SC	49	0.0%	12.2%	4.1%	16.3%	0.0%	12.2%
7	557 Dublin, GA	34	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	36.4%
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	66	0.0%	16.7%	3.0%	19.7%	10.6%	24.2%
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	98	3.1%	11.2%	7.1%	20.4%	11.2%	24.5%
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	80	5.0%	13.8%	0.0%	15.0%	2.5%	17.5%
8	546 Miami, FL	52	0.0%	17.3%	0.0%	17.3%	0.0%	17.3%
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	59	3.4%	10.2%	3.4%	13.6%	1.7%	15.3%
8	573 Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	2.9%	10.3%	4.4%	17.6%	4.4%	16.2%
8	673 Tampa, FL	90	3.3%	5.6%	0.0%	8.9%	1.1%	10.0%
9	614 Memphis, TN	37	2.7%	8.1%	5.4%	16.2%	2.7%	13.5%
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	97	1.0%	17.5%	0.0%	18.6%	0.0%	18.6%
9	626A4 Murfreesboro, TN	54	3.7%	7.4%	3.7%	14.8%	7.4%	16.7%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	141	2.1%	8.5%	3.5%	14.2%	7.8%	17.7%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	168	4.2%	15.5%	3.0%	20.8%	8.9%	24.4%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	99	2.0%	14.1%	4.0%	19.2%	6.1%	20.2%
10	552 Dayton, OH	17	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	11.8%

**Table 20 cont. Veterans' Report of Public Financial Support at Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Service Connected for Psychiatry %	Service Connected for Other %	Non-Service Connected Pension %	Any VA Benefit %	Social Security Disability %	Any VA or Non-VA Disability %
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	13	7.7%	7.7%	7.7%	23.1%	38.5%	61.5%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	39	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	5.1%
11	550 Danville, IL	31	3.2%	16.1%	9.7%	29.0%	19.4%	32.3%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	65	4.6%	20.0%	12.3%	30.8%	6.2%	24.6%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	181	2.2%	11.0%	2.8%	15.5%	5.0%	17.1%
12	578 Hines, IL	91	3.3%	6.6%	8.8%	18.7%	15.4%	25.3%
12	607 Madison, WI	16	0.0%	23.5%	0.0%	23.5%	5.9%	29.4%
12	676 Tomah, WI	47	6.4%	17.0%	8.5%	29.8%	6.4%	25.5%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	59	1.7%	13.6%	11.9%	27.1%	10.2%	25.4%
15	589 Kansas City, MO	91	5.5%	4.4%	0.0%	9.9%	1.1%	11.0%
15	589A5 Topeka, KS	27	0.0%	14.8%	7.4%	22.2%	7.4%	22.2%
15	589A6 Leavenworth, KS	41	4.9%	2.4%	7.3%	14.6%	4.9%	9.8%
16	520 Biloxi, MS	181	4.4%	11.0%	0.6%	14.9%	1.7%	16.6%
16	580 Houston, TX	186	3.2%	8.6%	3.8%	15.1%	5.4%	16.7%
16	586 Jackson, MS	40	7.5%	10.0%	0.0%	17.5%	7.5%	22.5%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	134	2.2%	16.4%	1.5%	19.4%	0.7%	18.7%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	41	0.0%	19.5%	7.3%	22.0%	0.0%	19.5%
17	549 Dallas, TX	385	4.4%	11.2%	6.5%	21.6%	4.4%	19.7%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	34	5.9%	2.9%	2.9%	11.8%	0.0%	8.8%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	111	4.5%	14.4%	12.6%	27.9%	4.5%	20.7%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	51	3.9%	15.7%	0.0%	19.6%	3.9%	23.5%
17	674 Temple, TX	257	3.9%	14.8%	1.9%	19.8%	1.6%	19.8%
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	94	0.0%	10.6%	13.8%	23.4%	11.7%	21.3%
18	649 Prescott, AZ	56	3.6%	17.9%	7.1%	26.8%	17.9%	30.4%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	56	3.6%	10.7%	0.0%	14.3%	1.8%	16.1%
19	554GE Colorado Springs, CO	10	9.1%	18.2%	0.0%	18.2%	18.2%	27.3%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	21	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	4.8%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	11	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	27.3%	9.1%	9.1%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	27	3.7%	7.4%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%
20	648 Portland, OR	88	3.4%	3.4%	1.1%	5.7%	1.1%	6.8%
20	653 Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	20.0%	20.0%	10.0%	50.0%	10.0%	60.0%
20	663A4 American Lake, WA	84	6.0%	25.3%	2.4%	32.5%	7.2%	33.7%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	12	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	16.7%
20	692 White City, OR	122	3.3%	9.8%	1.6%	13.9%	0.0%	12.3%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	10	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	68	1.5%	5.9%	2.9%	10.3%	13.2%	22.1%
21	654 Reno, NV	16	0.0%	6.3%	25.0%	31.3%	18.8%	25.0%
21	662 San Francisco, CA	70	5.7%	12.9%	10.0%	27.1%	32.9%	44.3%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	31	19.4%	19.4%	12.9%	41.9%	6.5%	38.7%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	73	8.2%	5.5%	5.5%	15.1%	24.7%	46.6%
22	664 San Diego, CA	42	14.3%	9.5%	9.5%	33.3%	26.2%	52.4%
22	691 West LA, CA	29	3.4%	0.0%	6.9%	10.3%	3.4%	6.9%
23	568 Ft. Meade, SD	34	5.9%	8.8%	11.8%	26.5%	8.8%	20.6%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	81	3.7%	6.2%	8.6%	18.5%	2.5%	12.3%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	36	5.6%	13.9%	8.3%	25.0%	11.1%	22.2%
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	12	8.3%	8.3%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	41.7%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	256	5.1%	12.5%	8.2%	21.5%	14.1%	26.6%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)			4.0%	11.8%	4.4%	19.1%	7.0%	21.3%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)			4.5%	11.7%	5.3%	20.2%	8.1%	22.5%
SITE S.D.			4.2%	5.9%	5.7%	8.7%	8.1%	11.3%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 21. Income in the 30 Days Prior to Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Mean Employment Income (month prior to admission) \$	Mean Other Income†† (month prior to admission) \$	Mean Total Income \$
1	405 White River Junction, VT	18	\$40.50	\$564.67	\$605.17
1	518 Bedford, MA	279	\$86.37	\$245.11	\$329.41
1	523 Boston, MA	25	\$289.60	\$130.32	\$419.92
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	85	\$10.35	\$162.72	\$173.07
1	631 Northampton, MA	113	\$45.18	\$195.53	\$240.71
1	650 Providence, RI	51	\$28.43	\$464.67	\$493.10
1	689 West Haven, CT	105	\$42.36	\$380.56	\$422.92
2	528 Buffalo, NY	71	\$27.11	\$194.66	\$221.77
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	54	\$31.48	\$146.00	\$177.48
2	528A6 Bath, NY	66	\$0.00	\$68.05	\$68.05
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	46	\$66.83	\$230.07	\$296.89
2	528A8 Albany, NY	117	\$31.96	\$241.49	\$271.38
3	526 Bronx, NY	140	\$16.87	\$172.47	\$189.35
3	561 E. Orange, NJ	19	\$0.00	\$219.79	\$219.79
3	561A4 Lyons, NJ	155	\$37.96	\$99.03	\$136.99
3	620 Montrose, NY	139	\$0.93	\$120.53	\$121.45
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	57	\$5.26	\$323.49	\$328.75
3	632 Northport, NY	44	\$23.82	\$305.25	\$329.07
4	529 Butler, PA	27	\$22.22	\$445.04	\$467.26
4	542 Coatesville, PA	298	\$26.84	\$49.84	\$76.67
4	595 Lebanon, PA	93	\$0.00	\$60.71	\$60.71
4	646A5 Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	\$8.48	\$120.70	\$129.17
4	693 Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	\$66.18	\$117.21	\$183.39
5	512 Baltimore, MD	34	\$8.00	\$225.91	\$233.91
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	157	\$7.01	\$153.17	\$160.18
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	149	\$0.00	\$184.99	\$184.99
5	688 Washington, DC	118	\$0.85	\$143.73	\$144.58
6	590 Hampton, VA	91	\$58.57	\$31.14	\$89.71
6	637 Asheville, NC	17	\$51.76	\$29.76	\$81.53
6	652 Richmond, VA	17	\$63.24	\$70.65	\$133.88
6	658 Salem, VA	77	\$36.17	\$240.90	\$277.06
7	508 Atlanta, GA	114	\$36.75	\$95.84	\$132.59
7	509 Augusta, GA	49	\$6.69	\$317.82	\$324.51
7	521 Birmingham, AL	51	\$52.55	\$105.78	\$158.33
7	534 Charleston, SC	59	\$18.47	\$193.05	\$211.53
7	544 Columbia, SC	49	\$197.41	\$99.16	\$296.57
7	557 Dublin, GA	34	\$3.18	\$62.48	\$65.67
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	66	\$0.79	\$142.45	\$143.24
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	98	\$25.26	\$276.60	\$301.86
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	80	\$0.00	\$83.65	\$83.65
8	546 Miami, FL	52	\$92.27	\$71.98	\$164.25
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	59	\$83.73	\$84.24	\$167.97
8	573 Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	\$31.62	\$120.84	\$152.46
8	673 Tampa, FL	90	\$19.78	\$64.39	\$84.17
9	614 Memphis, TN	37	\$8.11	\$114.70	\$122.81
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	97	\$0.00	\$28.77	\$28.77
9	626A4 Murfreesboro, TN	54	\$14.44	\$121.76	\$136.20
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	141	\$70.02	\$150.59	\$219.04
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	168	\$43.23	\$156.24	\$199.48
10	541 Cleveland, OH	99	\$24.37	\$103.63	\$128.00
10	552 Dayton, OH	17	\$3.53	\$6.06	\$9.59

**Table 21 cont. Income in the 30 Days Prior to Admission by Site for FY03 †**

				Mean Employment Income (month prior to admission)	Mean Other Income†† (month prior to admission)	Mean Total Income
VISN	SITE		N	\$	\$	\$
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	\$33.23	\$413.92	\$447.15
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	\$55.13	\$38.49	\$93.62
11	550	Danville, IL	31	\$82.06	\$238.77	\$320.84
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	\$51.35	\$211.88	\$263.23
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	\$16.66	\$102.04	\$118.71
12	578	Hines, IL	91	\$25.36	\$297.68	\$323.04
12	607	Madison, WI	16	\$135.65	\$366.53	\$502.18
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	\$36.51	\$226.62	\$263.13
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	\$67.86	\$182.64	\$250.51
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	\$18.57	\$36.14	\$54.71
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	\$6.48	\$137.19	\$143.67
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	\$0.00	\$124.49	\$124.49
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	\$68.23	\$97.28	\$165.51
16	580	Houston, TX	186	\$42.25	\$145.44	\$187.68
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	\$95.43	\$103.38	\$198.80
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	\$0.00	\$43.33	\$43.33
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	\$5.49	\$134.59	\$140.07
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	\$50.53	\$140.31	\$190.84
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	\$0.00	\$37.41	\$37.41
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	\$121.74	\$185.79	\$307.53
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	\$109.57	\$116.55	\$226.12
17	674	Temple, TX	257	\$56.24	\$83.44	\$139.68
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	\$46.85	\$270.47	\$317.32
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	\$12.50	\$233.84	\$246.34
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	\$96.75	\$44.88	\$141.63
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	\$145.45	\$238.91	\$384.36
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	\$28.57	\$7.43	\$36.00
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	\$0.00	\$248.18	\$248.18
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	\$127.78	\$194.59	\$322.37
20	648	Portland, OR	88	\$55.22	\$109.47	\$164.68
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	\$65.00	\$337.50	\$402.50
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	\$12.59	\$256.54	\$269.13
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	\$45.25	\$99.92	\$145.17
20	692	White City, OR	122	\$14.26	\$47.86	\$62.12
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	\$8.00	\$531.00	\$539.00
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	\$25.00	\$156.79	\$181.79
21	654	Reno, NV	16	\$2.88	\$454.75	\$457.63
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	\$22.23	\$547.60	\$569.83
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	\$333.74	\$459.52	\$793.26
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	\$29.82	\$497.58	\$527.40
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	\$9.52	\$692.17	\$701.69
22	691	West LA, CA	29	\$59.66	\$58.21	\$117.86
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	\$57.50	\$311.62	\$369.12
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	\$0.00	\$142.30	\$142.30
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	\$0.00	\$268.08	\$268.08
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	\$25.00	\$677.83	\$702.83
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	\$61.99	\$264.76	\$326.75
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				\$38.83	\$166.52	\$205.25
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				\$43.17	\$195.45	\$238.56
SITE S.D.				\$53.68	\$146.50	\$158.06

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

†† Mean other income includes service connected disability compensation, non-service connected pension, SSDI, SSI, Social Security Retirement, other disability (e.g. workman's compensation) and any other public support (e.g. food stamps, general relief).

**Table 22. Usual Residence in Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Outdoors / Shelter %	Other %
1	405 White River Junction, VT	18	72.2%	0.0%	16.7%	11.1%	0.0%
1	518 Bedford, MA	279	26.2%	9.0%	41.2%	21.9%	1.8%
1	523 Boston, MA	25	36.0%	8.0%	48.0%	8.0%	0.0%
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	85	15.3%	1.2%	58.8%	22.4%	2.4%
1	631 Northampton, MA	113	39.8%	3.5%	6.2%	48.7%	1.8%
1	650 Providence, RI	51	54.9%	11.8%	11.8%	21.6%	0.0%
1	689 West Haven, CT	105	61.0%	17.1%	1.9%	20.0%	0.0%
2	528 Buffalo, NY	71	53.5%	21.1%	5.6%	16.9%	2.8%
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	54	40.7%	9.3%	44.4%	5.6%	0.0%
2	528A6 Bath, NY	66	3.0%	0.0%	97.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	46	41.3%	26.1%	23.9%	6.5%	2.2%
2	528A8 Albany, NY	117	33.6%	12.1%	32.8%	18.1%	3.4%
3	526 Bronx, NY	140	50.4%	12.9%	0.0%	30.2%	6.5%
3	561 E. Orange, NJ	19	68.4%	21.1%	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%
3	561A4 Lyons, NJ	155	1.9%	0.0%	96.1%	1.3%	0.6%
3	620 Montrose, NY	139	21.6%	1.4%	64.7%	10.8%	1.4%
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	57	50.9%	3.5%	29.8%	15.8%	0.0%
3	632 Northport, NY	44	31.8%	18.2%	9.1%	36.4%	4.5%
4	529 Butler, PA	27	3.7%	3.7%	92.6%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542 Coatesville, PA	298	47.3%	2.3%	3.7%	44.6%	2.0%
4	595 Lebanon, PA	93	2.2%	9.7%	84.9%	3.2%	0.0%
4	646A5 Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	40.1%	13.7%	39.6%	5.6%	1.0%
4	693 Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	46.4%	28.6%	3.6%	21.4%	0.0%
5	512 Baltimore, MD	34	47.1%	35.3%	0.0%	17.6%	0.0%
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	157	47.1%	3.8%	27.4%	21.0%	0.6%
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	149	8.7%	2.7%	86.6%	2.0%	0.0%
5	688 Washington, DC	118	50.8%	22.9%	1.7%	24.6%	0.0%
6	590 Hampton, VA	91	5.5%	1.1%	93.4%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637 Asheville, NC	17	23.5%	17.6%	11.8%	35.3%	11.8%
6	652 Richmond, VA	17	47.1%	41.2%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%
6	658 Salem, VA	77	42.9%	5.2%	3.9%	45.5%	2.6%
7	508 Atlanta, GA	114	14.9%	55.3%	1.8%	26.3%	1.8%
7	509 Augusta, GA	49	57.1%	10.2%	24.5%	8.2%	0.0%
7	521 Birmingham, AL	51	27.5%	54.9%	7.8%	7.8%	2.0%
7	534 Charleston, SC	59	28.8%	67.8%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%
7	544 Columbia, SC	49	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	49.0%	8.2%
7	557 Dublin, GA	34	3.0%	0.0%	93.9%	3.0%	0.0%
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	66	45.5%	4.5%	10.6%	39.4%	0.0%
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	98	65.3%	8.2%	4.1%	21.4%	1.0%
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	80	15.0%	30.0%	53.8%	0.0%	1.3%
8	546 Miami, FL	52	28.8%	11.5%	38.5%	19.2%	1.9%
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	59	20.3%	74.6%	1.7%	3.4%	0.0%
8	573 Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	48.5%	11.8%	13.2%	26.5%	0.0%
8	673 Tampa, FL	90	22.2%	53.3%	0.0%	23.3%	1.1%
9	614 Memphis, TN	37	56.8%	27.0%	2.7%	13.5%	0.0%
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	97	0.0%	1.0%	99.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4 Murfreesboro, TN	54	59.3%	18.5%	1.9%	20.4%	0.0%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	141	47.5%	4.3%	17.0%	22.0%	9.2%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	168	37.5%	9.5%	48.2%	4.2%	0.6%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	99	22.2%	0.0%	53.5%	23.2%	1.0%
10	552 Dayton, OH	17	52.9%	0.0%	29.4%	11.8%	5.9%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	13	61.5%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	15.4%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	39	48.7%	5.1%	5.1%	41.0%	0.0%
11	550 Danville, IL	31	54.8%	0.0%	6.5%	32.3%	6.5%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	65	56.9%	15.4%	0.0%	27.7%	0.0%

**Table 22 cont. Usual Residence in Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Outdoors / Shelter %	Other %
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	13	61.5%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	15.4%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	39	48.7%	5.1%	5.1%	41.0%	0.0%
11	550 Danville, IL	31	54.8%	0.0%	6.5%	32.3%	6.5%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	65	56.9%	15.4%	0.0%	27.7%	0.0%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	181	16.6%	11.6%	65.7%	6.1%	0.0%
12	578 Hines, IL	91	63.7%	26.4%	1.1%	8.8%	0.0%
12	607 Madison, WI	16	58.8%	41.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676 Tomah, WI	47	14.9%	36.2%	38.3%	10.6%	0.0%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	59	28.8%	0.0%	61.0%	10.2%	0.0%
15	589 Kansas City, MO	91	33.0%	11.0%	51.6%	3.3%	1.1%
15	589A5 Topeka, KS	27	37.0%	7.4%	29.6%	25.9%	0.0%
15	589A6 Leavenworth, KS	41	4.9%	0.0%	95.1%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520 Biloxi, MS	181	42.5%	2.2%	23.8%	31.5%	0.0%
16	580 Houston, TX	186	41.9%	41.4%	0.5%	15.6%	0.5%
16	586 Jackson, MS	40	37.5%	17.5%	5.0%	40.0%	0.0%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	134	7.5%	5.2%	85.1%	2.2%	0.0%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	41	46.3%	34.1%	4.9%	14.6%	0.0%
17	549 Dallas, TX	385	30.9%	8.8%	8.8%	46.8%	4.7%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	34	2.9%	0.0%	97.1%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	111	32.4%	2.7%	1.8%	63.1%	0.0%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	51	54.9%	19.6%	3.9%	21.6%	0.0%
17	674 Temple, TX	257	30.7%	3.5%	33.5%	31.9%	0.4%
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	94	62.8%	23.4%	7.4%	4.3%	2.1%
18	649 Prescott, AZ	56	16.1%	5.4%	67.9%	10.7%	0.0%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	56	8.9%	89.3%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%
19	554GE Colorado Springs, CO	10	54.5%	27.3%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	21	47.6%	28.6%	0.0%	23.8%	0.0%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	11	18.2%	0.0%	9.1%	63.6%	9.1%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	27	11.1%	11.1%	63.0%	7.4%	7.4%
20	648 Portland, OR	88	39.8%	36.4%	5.7%	17.0%	1.1%
20	653 Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	50.0%	0.0%	40.0%	10.0%	0.0%
20	663A4 American Lake, WA	84	49.4%	4.8%	32.5%	13.3%	0.0%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	12	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
20	692 White City, OR	122	0.8%	0.0%	98.4%	0.8%	0.0%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	10	50.0%	40.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	68	14.7%	5.9%	58.8%	20.6%	0.0%
21	654 Reno, NV	16	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
21	662 San Francisco, CA	70	54.3%	28.6%	4.3%	11.4%	1.4%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	31	48.4%	38.7%	0.0%	9.7%	3.2%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	73	42.5%	39.7%	1.4%	16.4%	0.0%
22	664 San Diego, CA	42	57.1%	35.7%	4.8%	2.4%	0.0%
22	691 West LA, CA	29	44.8%	27.6%	17.2%	6.9%	3.4%
23	568 Ft. Meade, SD	34	58.8%	5.9%	35.3%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	81	4.9%	1.2%	93.8%	0.0%	0.0%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	36	47.2%	41.7%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	12	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	256	59.8%	5.5%	21.5%	12.9%	0.4%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)			34.4%	13.9%	31.4%	18.9%	1.3%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)			36.8%	16.9%	28.2%	16.7%	1.4%
SITE S.D.			19.5%	18.4%	31.9%	14.5%	2.7%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03:

VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

†† Includes own apartment, room or house; apartment, room or house of friend or family member and hotel or SRO

**Table 23. Homeless When Last in Community and History of Job Loss Due to Substance Use by Site for FY03 †**

VISN			SITE	N	Homeless When Last Living in the Community	Any Job Lost Due to Substance Abuse
					%	%
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	16.7%	38.9%	
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	65.6%	57.2%	
1	523	Boston, MA	25	45.8%	80.0%	
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	83.5%	69.4%	
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	75.2%	63.7%	
1	650	Providence, RI	51	54.9%	33.3%	
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	35.2%	44.8%	
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	54.9%	57.7%	
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	42.6%	38.9%	
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	75.8%	68.2%	
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	47.8%	47.8%	
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	69.8%	66.7%	
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	43.2%	35.3%	
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	21.1%	63.2%	
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	99.4%	50.3%	
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	57.6%	54.0%	
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	59.6%	56.1%	
3	632	Northport, NY	44	77.3%	68.2%	
4	529	Butler, PA	27	66.7%	77.8%	
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	85.6%	57.0%	
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	68.8%	66.7%	
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	57.4%	52.3%	
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	57.1%	53.6%	
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	38.2%	64.7%	
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	65.6%	62.4%	
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	83.9%	30.2%	
5	688	Washington, DC	118	22.0%	50.0%	
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	63.7%	71.1%	
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	58.8%	82.4%	
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	47.1%	35.3%	
6	658	Salem, VA	77	63.6%	45.5%	
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	91.2%	74.6%	
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	53.1%	36.7%	
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	72.5%	51.0%	
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	33.9%	52.5%	
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	89.8%	42.9%	
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	100.0%	78.1%	
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	69.7%	31.8%	
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	43.9%	51.0%	
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	63.8%	48.8%	
8	546	Miami, FL	52	55.8%	59.6%	
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	5.1%	50.8%	
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	47.1%	66.2%	
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	53.3%	27.8%	
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	40.5%	59.5%	
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	75.3%	63.9%	
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	85.2%	98.1%	
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	72.3%	75.9%	
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	56.5%	71.4%	
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	83.8%	58.6%	
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	52.9%	64.7%	

**Table 23 cont. Homeless When Last in Community and History of Job Loss Due to Substance Use by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	Homeless When Last Living in the Community %	Any Job Lost Due to Substance Abuse %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	30.8%	46.2%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	74.4%	79.5%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	80.6%	48.4%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	43.1%	36.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	68.5%	68.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	57.1%	47.3%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	23.5%	58.8%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	42.6%	74.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	71.2%	64.4%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	50.5%	82.4%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	55.6%	70.4%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	43.9%	97.6%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	81.2%	39.2%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	47.8%	44.6%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	52.5%	45.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	32.8%	62.7%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	75.6%	61.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	65.2%	76.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	79.4%	79.4%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	76.6%	39.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	60.8%	41.2%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	76.3%	43.2%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	55.3%	48.9%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	50.0%	46.4%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	73.2%	92.9%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	81.8%	54.5%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	42.9%	38.1%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	63.6%	54.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	74.1%	55.6%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	55.7%	40.9%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	20.0%	60.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	55.4%	45.8%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	75.0%	75.0%
20	692	White City, OR	122	80.3%	50.8%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	30.0%	60.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	76.5%	64.7%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	43.8%	56.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	70.0%	45.7%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	54.8%	25.8%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	46.6%	71.2%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	31.0%	31.0%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	34.5%	44.8%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	29.4%	76.5%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	74.1%	64.2%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	55.6%	50.0%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	8.3%	16.7%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	48.4%	64.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				<b>62.5%</b>	<b>56.8%</b>
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				<b>57.9%</b>	<b>56.6%</b>
SITE S.D.				<b>19.8%</b>	<b>15.9%</b>

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 24. Clinical Psychiatric Diagnoses at Admission by Site for FY03 †**

						Any Substance Abuse / Dependency %	Serious Mental Illness †† %	Dually Diagnosed ††† %
VISN	SITE		N	Alcohol Abuse / Dependency %	Drug Abuse/ Dependency %			
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	50.0%	16.7%	50.0%	83.3%	44.4%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	75.3%	39.4%	79.9%	68.5%	55.2%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	76.0%	48.0%	88.0%	36.0%	28.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	85.9%	51.8%	94.1%	51.8%	45.9%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	84.1%	54.9%	90.3%	58.4%	52.2%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	41.2%	29.4%	49.0%	74.5%	27.5%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	63.8%	46.7%	76.2%	76.2%	55.2%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	74.6%	63.4%	84.5%	59.2%	47.9%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	57.4%	57.4%	77.8%	46.3%	27.8%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	89.4%	65.2%	97.0%	42.4%	40.9%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	71.7%	50.0%	78.3%	39.1%	28.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	68.4%	60.7%	81.2%	66.7%	52.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	61.2%	74.1%	87.8%	46.0%	41.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	68.4%	78.9%	100.0%	31.6%	31.6%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	73.5%	79.4%	94.8%	38.1%	34.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	82.7%	74.8%	94.2%	43.2%	38.8%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	73.7%	70.2%	84.2%	63.2%	50.9%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	75.0%	65.9%	90.9%	56.8%	50.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	92.6%	55.6%	100.0%	48.1%	48.1%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	77.5%	77.9%	94.3%	28.2%	25.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	75.3%	84.9%	97.8%	38.7%	37.6%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	72.6%	67.0%	85.3%	49.7%	40.1%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	75.0%	42.9%	85.7%	67.9%	57.1%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	70.6%	88.2%	97.1%	58.8%	55.9%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	60.5%	66.2%	88.5%	46.5%	39.5%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	76.5%	68.5%	80.5%	61.1%	49.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	61.9%	74.6%	89.8%	40.7%	33.1%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	83.5%	92.3%	95.6%	25.3%	23.1%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	94.1%	70.6%	100.0%	41.2%	41.2%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	47.1%	76.5%	94.1%	35.3%	35.3%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	76.6%	53.2%	89.6%	27.3%	18.2%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	78.9%	83.3%	98.2%	36.8%	35.1%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	65.3%	59.2%	73.5%	77.6%	57.1%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	80.4%	72.5%	96.1%	27.5%	27.5%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	88.1%	59.3%	93.2%	37.3%	32.2%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	57.1%	51.0%	65.3%	26.5%	16.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	81.8%	72.7%	87.9%	51.5%	42.4%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	74.2%	74.2%	84.8%	31.8%	22.7%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	66.3%	53.1%	81.6%	51.0%	39.8%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	81.3%	51.3%	97.5%	28.8%	28.8%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	80.8%	69.2%	92.3%	59.6%	53.8%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	78.0%	62.7%	86.4%	37.3%	27.1%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	76.5%	69.1%	91.2%	42.6%	35.3%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	87.8%	66.7%	95.6%	17.8%	16.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	67.6%	73.0%	91.9%	27.0%	21.6%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	85.6%	57.7%	90.7%	50.5%	47.4%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	96.3%	83.3%	96.3%	42.6%	38.9%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	85.8%	63.1%	89.4%	51.1%	42.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	84.5%	81.5%	88.7%	42.9%	40.5%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	82.8%	83.8%	94.9%	40.4%	37.4%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	76.5%	70.6%	82.4%	35.3%	29.4%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	38.5%	30.8%	38.5%	100.0%	38.5%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	87.2%	69.2%	100.0%	66.7%	66.7%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	83.9%	74.2%	93.5%	38.7%	38.7%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	38.5%	52.3%	64.6%	47.7%	21.5%

**Table 24 cont. Clinical Psychiatric Diagnoses at Admission by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Alcohol Abuse / Dependency %	Drug Abuse/ Dependency %	Any Substance Abuse / Dependency %	Serious Mental Illness †† %	Dually Diagnosed ††† %
12	556 North Chicago, IL	181	79.0%	79.0%	97.8%	<b>32.6%</b>	30.4%
12	578 Hines, IL	91	62.6%	64.8%	83.5%	56.0%	41.8%
12	607 Madison, WI	16	94.1%	52.9%	94.1%	52.9%	47.1%
12	676 Tomah, WI	47	85.1%	57.4%	93.6%	63.8%	59.6%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	59	81.4%	76.3%	91.5%	59.3%	54.2%
15	589 Kansas City, MO	91	91.2%	69.2%	93.4%	54.9%	49.5%
15	589A5 Topeka, KS	27	88.5%	29.6%	92.6%	63.0%	59.3%
15	589A6 Leavenworth, KS	41	97.6%	97.6%	97.6%	97.6%	95.1%
16	520 Biloxi, MS	181	63.0%	48.6%	75.7%	38.7%	25.4%
16	580 Houston, TX	186	51.6%	58.6%	70.4%	36.0%	21.5%
16	586 Jackson, MS	40	72.5%	52.5%	87.5%	40.0%	32.5%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	134	88.8%	82.8%	94.8%	<b>18.7%</b>	16.4%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	41	70.7%	63.4%	90.2%	63.4%	56.1%
17	549 Dallas, TX	385	81.8%	79.5%	92.5%	54.3%	48.8%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	34	82.4%	73.5%	97.1%	52.9%	52.9%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	111	69.4%	58.6%	80.2%	64.0%	51.4%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	51	52.9%	47.1%	72.5%	51.0%	33.3%
17	674 Temple, TX	257	58.8%	39.7%	69.6%	45.5%	29.2%
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	94	50.0%	40.4%	74.5%	71.3%	50.0%
18	649 Prescott, AZ	56	66.1%	33.9%	76.8%	66.1%	48.2%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	56	91.1%	62.5%	96.4%	48.2%	48.2%
19	554GE Colorado Springs, CO	10	63.6%	36.4%	90.9%	72.7%	72.7%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	21	42.9%	33.3%	52.4%	85.7%	52.4%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	11	90.9%	18.2%	90.9%	45.5%	45.5%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	27	74.1%	51.9%	77.8%	<b>33.3%</b>	18.5%
20	648 Portland, OR	88	50.0%	38.6%	64.8%	48.9%	27.3%
20	653 Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	70.0%	60.0%	80.0%	80.0%	60.0%
20	663A4 American Lake, WA	84	49.4%	39.8%	60.2%	56.6%	30.1%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	12	100.0%	33.3%	100.0%	<b>16.7%</b>	16.7%
20	692 White City, OR	122	85.2%	59.0%	90.2%	38.5%	35.2%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	10	70.0%	40.0%	80.0%	70.0%	50.0%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	68	74.6%	62.7%	88.1%	<b>31.3%</b>	26.9%
21	654 Reno, NV	16	43.8%	25.0%	56.3%	75.0%	43.8%
21	662 San Francisco, CA	70	48.6%	61.4%	77.1%	67.1%	52.9%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	31	51.6%	48.4%	64.5%	45.2%	19.4%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	73	87.7%	68.5%	94.5%	42.5%	37.0%
22	664 San Diego, CA	42	35.7%	35.7%	47.6%	76.2%	38.1%
22	691 West LA, CA	29	65.5%	72.4%	82.8%	69.0%	51.7%
23	568 Ft. Meade, SD	34	94.1%	20.6%	97.1%	47.1%	47.1%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	81	87.7%	48.1%	93.8%	59.3%	56.8%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	36	66.7%	33.3%	72.2%	58.3%	33.3%
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	12	58.3%	50.0%	75.0%	66.7%	41.7%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	256	82.0%	53.9%	94.1%	40.6%	37.5%
<b>VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)</b>			<b>73.5%</b>	<b>62.6%</b>	<b>86.1%</b>	<b>47.8%</b>	<b>38.9%</b>
<b>SITE AVERAGE (N=98)</b>			<b>73.2%</b>	<b>59.2%</b>	<b>85.4%</b>	<b>50.2%</b>	<b>40.4%</b>
<b>SITE S.D.</b>			<b>14.3%</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>13.6%</b>

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

†† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories: schizophrenia, other psychotic disorder, affective disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD and other anxiety disorders.

††† Dual Diagnosis is defined as having both a substance abuse disorder and a serious psychiatric disorder.

**Table 25. Presence of a Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	Any Psychiatric Disorder†† %	Any Disabling Medical Condition %	Any Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	94.4%	66.7%	100.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	96.8%	63.1%	99.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	100.0%	64.0%	100.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	100.0%	61.2%	100.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	96.5%	63.7%	99.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	96.1%	82.4%	100.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	99.0%	61.9%	100.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	98.6%	63.4%	100.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	96.3%	51.9%	100.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	98.5%	57.6%	98.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	91.3%	65.2%	100.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	96.6%	64.1%	99.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	100.0%	54.0%	100.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	100.0%	26.3%	100.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	98.1%	31.6%	100.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	99.3%	42.4%	100.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	100.0%	35.1%	100.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	100.0%	65.9%	100.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	100.0%	40.7%	100.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	99.3%	36.6%	100.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	98.9%	29.0%	98.9%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	97.0%	65.5%	100.0%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	96.4%	50.0%	100.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	100.0%	67.6%	100.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	96.2%	33.8%	100.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	97.3%	71.8%	100.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	98.3%	39.8%	100.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	97.8%	56.0%	98.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	100.0%	70.6%	100.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	94.1%	88.2%	100.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	100.0%	49.4%	100.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	100.0%	68.4%	100.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	93.9%	73.5%	100.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	98.0%	51.0%	100.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	100.0%	50.8%	100.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	95.9%	83.7%	100.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	100.0%	75.8%	100.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	98.5%	36.4%	100.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	94.9%	51.0%	100.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	97.5%	66.3%	100.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	100.0%	80.8%	100.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	98.3%	67.8%	100.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	98.5%	33.8%	100.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	97.8%	58.9%	100.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	97.3%	21.6%	100.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	93.8%	82.5%	99.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	100.0%	70.4%	100.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	99.3%	53.2%	100.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	94.0%	54.2%	99.4%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	100.0%	37.4%	100.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	94.1%	76.5%	100.0%

**Table 25 cont. Presence of a Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition by Site for FY03 †**

VISN			SITE	N	Any Psychiatric Disorder†† %	Any Disabling Medical Condition %	Any Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	100.0%	69.2%	100.0%	
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	100.0%	82.1%	100.0%	
11	550	Danville, IL	31	96.8%	38.7%	100.0%	
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	98.5%	70.8%	100.0%	
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	100.0%	60.2%	100.0%	
12	578	Hines, IL	91	98.9%	65.9%	100.0%	
12	607	Madison, WI	16	100.0%	76.5%	100.0%	
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	97.9%	68.1%	100.0%	
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	96.6%	81.4%	98.3%	
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	98.9%	33.0%	100.0%	
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	96.3%	25.9%	100.0%	
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	100.0%	90.2%	100.0%	
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	92.3%	27.6%	99.4%	
16	580	Houston, TX	186	89.2%	63.4%	100.0%	
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	95.0%	72.5%	100.0%	
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	97.8%	8.2%	97.8%	
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	97.6%	70.7%	100.0%	
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	99.5%	69.6%	100.0%	
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	97.1%	58.8%	100.0%	
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	97.3%	69.4%	99.1%	
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	94.1%	58.8%	100.0%	
17	674	Temple, TX	257	89.9%	67.3%	98.8%	
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	95.7%	64.9%	98.9%	
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	96.4%	80.4%	100.0%	
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	96.4%	57.1%	100.0%	
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	90.9%	81.8%	100.0%	
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	95.2%	42.9%	100.0%	
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	90.9%	27.3%	90.9%	
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	96.3%	59.3%	100.0%	
20	648	Portland, OR	88	87.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	100.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	89.2%	69.9%	100.0%	
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
20	692	White City, OR	122	93.4%	60.7%	98.4%	
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	100.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	95.5%	55.2%	100.0%	
21	654	Reno, NV	16	100.0%	81.3%	100.0%	
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	95.7%	57.1%	100.0%	
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	93.5%	29.0%	100.0%	
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	100.0%	54.8%	100.0%	
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	85.7%	85.7%	100.0%	
22	691	West LA, CA	29	100.0%	48.3%	100.0%	
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	100.0%	41.2%	100.0%	
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	100.0%	97.5%	100.0%	
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	97.2%	44.4%	100.0%	
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	100.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	98.0%	50.4%	100.0%	
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				97.0%	56.6%	99.7%	
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				97.1%	58.0%	99.7%	
SITE S.D.				3.1%	17.8%	1.0%	

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

†† Includes substance abuse disorders.

**Table 26. Self-Reported Lifetime Hospitalizations for Mental Health Problems by Site for FY03 †**

VISN			SITE	N	Ever Hospitalized for Alcohol Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Drug Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Psychiatric Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Any Mental Health Problem %
1	405		White River Junction, VT	18	55.6%	22.2%	66.7%	88.9%
1	518		Bedford, MA	279	72.8%	38.4%	38.4%	86.0%
1	523		Boston, MA	25	76.0%	40.0%	24.0%	96.0%
1	523A5		Brockton, MA	85	91.8%	49.4%	43.5%	98.8%
1	631		Northampton, MA	113	75.2%	39.8%	37.2%	83.2%
1	650		Providence, RI	51	47.1%	31.4%	68.6%	86.3%
1	689		West Haven, CT	105	59.0%	44.8%	57.1%	85.7%
2	528		Buffalo, NY	71	74.6%	62.0%	45.1%	85.9%
2	528A5		Canandaigua, NY	54	68.5%	68.5%	25.9%	94.4%
2	528A6		Bath, NY	66	66.7%	54.5%	27.3%	81.8%
2	528A7		Syracuse, NY	46	63.0%	47.8%	30.4%	73.9%
2	528A8		Albany, NY	117	62.1%	57.8%	49.1%	86.2%
3	526		Bronx, NY	140	33.1%	48.2%	18.7%	57.6%
3	561		E. Orange, NJ	19	47.4%	63.2%	15.8%	84.2%
3	561A4		Lyons, NJ	155	52.3%	55.5%	35.5%	74.2%
3	620		Montrose, NY	139	79.9%	69.8%	25.9%	92.8%
3	630A4		Brooklyn, NY	57	80.7%	71.9%	70.2%	98.2%
3	632		Northport, NY	44	68.2%	50.0%	45.5%	81.8%
4	529		Butler, PA	27	92.6%	51.9%	48.1%	96.3%
4	542		Coatesville, PA	298	53.0%	60.7%	23.8%	76.2%
4	595		Lebanon, PA	93	72.0%	79.6%	33.3%	93.5%
4	646A5		Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	55.8%	61.9%	50.8%	87.3%
4	693		Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	67.9%	42.9%	46.4%	92.9%
5	512		Baltimore, MD	34	47.1%	70.6%	41.2%	85.3%
5	512A5		Perry Point, MD	157	65.6%	61.8%	45.9%	88.5%
5	613		Martinsburg, WV	149	69.1%	62.4%	48.3%	82.6%
5	688		Washington, DC	118	25.4%	44.1%	28.8%	55.1%
6	590		Hampton, VA	91	86.8%	95.6%	31.9%	98.9%
6	637		Asheville, NC	17	94.1%	70.6%	52.9%	100.0%
6	652		Richmond, VA	17	52.9%	76.5%	41.2%	100.0%
6	658		Salem, VA	77	76.6%	53.2%	27.3%	97.4%
7	508		Atlanta, GA	114	44.7%	52.6%	29.8%	65.8%
7	509		Augusta, GA	49	61.2%	53.1%	61.2%	85.7%
7	521		Birmingham, AL	51	51.0%	49.0%	27.5%	66.7%
7	534		Charleston, SC	59	61.0%	40.7%	25.4%	72.9%
7	544		Columbia, SC	49	42.9%	36.7%	30.6%	61.2%
7	557		Dublin, GA	34	90.9%	75.8%	30.3%	97.0%
7	619A4		Tuskegee, AL	66	51.5%	53.0%	37.9%	78.8%
7	679		Tuscaloosa, AL	98	76.5%	59.2%	54.1%	91.8%
8	516		Bay Pines, FL	80	78.8%	47.5%	25.0%	93.8%
8	546		Miami, FL	52	69.2%	50.0%	25.0%	80.8%
8	548		West Palm Beach, FL	59	54.2%	30.5%	30.5%	67.8%
8	573		Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	75.0%	70.6%	39.7%	97.1%
8	673		Tampa, FL	90	31.1%	20.0%	15.6%	38.9%
9	614		Memphis, TN	37	75.7%	67.6%	29.7%	94.6%
9	621		Mountain Home, TN	97	71.1%	45.4%	32.0%	84.5%
9	626A4		Murfreesboro, TN	54	98.1%	85.2%	42.6%	100.0%
10	538		Chillicothe, OH	141	80.1%	61.0%	41.8%	93.6%
10	539		Cincinnati, OH	168	82.1%	78.6%	38.1%	86.9%
10	541		Cleveland, OH	99	80.8%	68.7%	46.5%	91.9%
10	552		Dayton, OH	17	76.5%	64.7%	58.8%	88.2%

**Table 26 cont. Self-Reported Lifetime Hospitalizations for Mental Health Problems by Site for FY03 †**

				Ever Hospitalized for Alcohol Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Drug Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Psychiatric Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Any Mental Health Problem %
VISN	SITE		N				
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	53.8%	38.5%	61.5%	76.9%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	87.2%	74.4%	43.6%	94.9%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	58.1%	48.4%	35.5%	71.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	30.8%	30.8%	26.2%	61.5%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	79.6%	78.5%	35.4%	100.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	58.2%	64.8%	56.0%	85.7%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	58.8%	41.2%	23.5%	76.5%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	87.2%	53.2%	53.2%	91.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	69.5%	67.8%	35.6%	84.7%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	92.3%	81.3%	46.2%	96.7%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	92.6%	48.1%	66.7%	96.3%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	97.6%	100.0%	90.2%	100.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	55.8%	40.3%	36.5%	75.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	41.4%	45.7%	30.6%	67.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	60.0%	40.0%	25.0%	72.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	92.5%	84.3%	20.1%	97.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	61.0%	43.9%	41.5%	80.5%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	59.0%	61.3%	40.8%	74.3%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	70.6%	58.8%	38.2%	82.4%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	38.7%	42.3%	34.2%	63.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	47.1%	45.1%	47.1%	72.5%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	57.6%	45.9%	28.4%	77.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	37.2%	33.0%	53.2%	75.5%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	69.6%	35.7%	60.7%	92.9%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	87.5%	58.9%	32.1%	94.6%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	63.6%	18.2%	27.3%	63.6%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	38.1%	23.8%	23.8%	57.1%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	63.6%	9.1%	45.5%	72.7%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	77.8%	51.9%	29.6%	88.9%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	51.1%	37.5%	29.5%	69.3%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	80.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	44.6%	24.1%	24.1%	55.4%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	66.7%	16.7%	8.3%	75.0%
20	692	White City, OR	122	71.3%	47.5%	30.3%	76.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	50.0%	10.0%	30.0%	60.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	73.5%	60.3%	29.4%	89.7%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	62.5%	37.5%	75.0%	93.8%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	44.3%	48.6%	45.7%	72.9%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	58.1%	45.2%	45.2%	87.1%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	53.4%	45.2%	35.6%	65.8%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	42.9%	33.3%	40.5%	59.5%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	58.6%	79.3%	58.6%	89.7%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	91.2%	11.8%	38.2%	94.1%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	92.6%	44.4%	63.0%	98.8%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	66.7%	30.6%	41.7%	86.1%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	58.3%	41.7%	91.7%	100.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	80.9%	52.7%	35.9%	93.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				64.5%	54.3%	37.8%	82.0%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				65.5%	51.4%	40.1%	83.0%
SITE S.D.				16.9%	18.2%	15.2%	13.2%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 27. Self-Reported Legal History by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Never Been Arrested %	Arrested 1 Time %	Arrested 2-5 Times %	Arrested 6-10 Times %	More Than 10 Times %	Been in Jail/Priso n %	Jail/Prison < 2 Weeks %	Jail/Prison 2 Weeks or More %
1	405 White River Junction, VT	18	27.8%	22.2%	33.3%	11.1%	5.6%	38.9%	22.2%	38.9%
1	518 Bedford, MA	279	16.7%	22.3%	31.8%	9.8%	19.3%	48.3%	8.7%	43.0%
1	523 Boston, MA	25	20.8%	12.5%	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	20.8%	45.8%
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	85	13.1%	22.6%	35.7%	16.7%	11.9%	45.9%	8.2%	45.9%
1	631 Northampton, MA	113	20.4%	17.7%	36.3%	15.0%	10.6%	31.0%	21.2%	47.8%
1	650 Providence, RI	51	39.1%	10.9%	26.1%	10.9%	13.0%	52.2%	17.4%	30.4%
1	689 West Haven, CT	105	25.0%	17.3%	42.3%	9.6%	5.8%	38.1%	23.8%	38.1%
2	528 Buffalo, NY	71	18.6%	12.9%	51.4%	12.9%	4.3%	37.1%	18.6%	44.3%
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	54	42.6%	20.4%	25.9%	7.4%	3.7%	50.0%	13.0%	37.0%
2	528A6 Bath, NY	66	28.8%	10.6%	45.5%	7.6%	7.6%	43.9%	13.6%	42.4%
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	46	28.3%	15.2%	41.3%	8.7%	6.5%	39.1%	21.7%	39.1%
2	528A8 Albany, NY	117	21.4%	19.7%	40.2%	12.8%	6.0%	35.0%	12.0%	53.0%
3	526 Bronx, NY	140	28.1%	15.8%	39.6%	7.9%	8.6%	40.3%	5.0%	54.7%
3	561 E. Orange, NJ	19	38.9%	22.2%	33.3%	0.0%	5.6%	36.8%	52.6%	10.5%
3	561A4 Lyons, NJ	155	21.3%	13.5%	40.0%	11.0%	14.2%	29.7%	16.1%	54.2%
3	620 Montrose, NY	139	26.6%	10.8%	37.4%	9.4%	15.8%	41.7%	7.2%	51.1%
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	57	38.6%	8.8%	36.8%	5.3%	10.5%	59.6%	7.0%	33.3%
3	632 Northport, NY	44	25.6%	18.6%	34.9%	16.3%	4.7%	37.2%	20.9%	41.9%
4	529 Butler, PA	27	7.4%	18.5%	48.1%	14.8%	11.1%	7.4%	55.6%	37.0%
4	542 Coatesville, PA	298	25.3%	25.6%	39.7%	7.1%	2.4%	41.1%	13.8%	45.1%
4	595 Lebanon, PA	93	9.7%	20.4%	49.5%	11.8%	8.6%	17.2%	21.5%	61.3%
4	646A5 Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	15.2%	17.8%	48.2%	7.6%	11.2%	30.5%	15.7%	53.8%
4	693 Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	50.0%	10.7%	28.6%	3.6%	7.1%	53.6%	17.9%	28.6%
5	512 Baltimore, MD	34	17.6%	23.5%	38.2%	17.6%	2.9%	35.3%	8.8%	55.9%
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	157	21.0%	21.0%	43.9%	10.2%	3.8%	35.0%	15.9%	49.0%
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	149	22.1%	16.1%	45.0%	8.1%	8.7%	26.8%	22.1%	51.0%
5	688 Washington, DC	118	19.7%	18.8%	48.7%	11.1%	1.7%	33.9%	16.1%	50.0%
6	590 Hampton, VA	91	12.1%	19.8%	42.9%	18.7%	6.6%	25.3%	17.6%	57.1%
6	637 Asheville, NC	17	5.9%	11.8%	58.8%	11.8%	11.8%	11.8%	23.5%	64.7%
6	652 Richmond, VA	17	0.0%	5.9%	70.6%	0.0%	23.5%	0.0%	17.6%	82.4%
6	658 Salem, VA	77	23.7%	17.1%	39.5%	13.2%	6.6%	34.2%	27.6%	38.2%
7	508 Atlanta, GA	114	8.8%	15.8%	43.9%	14.0%	17.5%	18.4%	14.0%	67.5%
7	509 Augusta, GA	49	22.4%	10.2%	59.2%	8.2%	0.0%	38.8%	18.4%	42.9%
7	521 Birmingham, AL	51	6.0%	12.0%	58.0%	16.0%	8.0%	14.0%	32.0%	54.0%
7	534 Charleston, SC	59	8.5%	15.3%	61.0%	8.5%	6.8%	10.2%	35.6%	54.2%
7	544 Columbia, SC	49	10.2%	14.3%	67.3%	2.0%	6.1%	16.3%	16.3%	67.3%
7	557 Dublin, GA	34	15.2%	12.1%	63.6%	9.1%	0.0%	21.2%	36.4%	42.4%
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	66	30.3%	19.7%	47.0%	3.0%	0.0%	56.1%	15.2%	28.8%
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	98	19.4%	14.3%	35.7%	11.2%	19.4%	27.6%	27.6%	44.9%
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	80	13.9%	16.5%	46.8%	10.1%	12.7%	26.6%	12.7%	60.8%
8	546 Miami, FL	52	17.6%	15.7%	43.1%	11.8%	11.8%	17.6%	23.5%	58.8%
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	59	18.6%	18.6%	35.6%	11.9%	15.3%	28.8%	16.9%	54.2%
8	573 Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	17.6%	22.1%	44.1%	10.3%	5.9%	26.5%	20.6%	52.9%
8	673 Tampa, FL	90	23.3%	15.6%	46.7%	2.2%	12.2%	41.1%	10.0%	48.9%
9	614 Memphis, TN	37	18.9%	18.9%	54.1%	5.4%	2.7%	24.3%	8.1%	67.6%
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	97	30.9%	16.5%	33.0%	8.2%	11.3%	38.1%	22.7%	39.2%
9	626A4 Murfreesboro, TN	54	5.7%	22.6%	56.6%	3.8%	11.3%	9.4%	26.4%	64.2%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	141	12.8%	17.7%	44.7%	10.6%	14.2%	17.7%	25.5%	56.7%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	168	18.0%	19.8%	37.7%	13.2%	11.4%	33.5%	19.2%	47.3%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	99	8.1%	8.1%	58.6%	12.1%	13.1%	14.1%	15.2%	70.7%
10	552 Dayton, OH	17	17.6%	17.6%	52.9%	5.9%	5.9%	23.5%	17.6%	58.8%

**Table 27. Self-Reported Legal History by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Never Been Arrested %	Arrested 1 Time %	Arrested 2-5 Times %	Arrested 6-10 Times %	More Than 10 Times %	Been in Jail/Priso n %	Jail/Prison < 2 Weeks %	Jail/Prison 2 Weeks or More %
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	13	15.4%	15.4%	53.8%	0.0%	15.4%	23.1%	15.4%	61.5%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	39	12.8%	12.8%	48.7%	12.8%	12.8%	17.9%	23.1%	59.0%
11	550 Danville, IL	31	6.5%	12.9%	54.8%	19.4%	6.5%	12.9%	38.7%	48.4%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	65	23.1%	13.8%	44.6%	10.8%	7.7%	29.2%	18.5%	52.3%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	181	5.0%	10.5%	49.7%	18.8%	16.0%	38.7%	13.3%	48.1%
12	578 Hines, IL	91	19.3%	18.2%	40.9%	9.1%	12.5%	54.5%	6.8%	38.6%
12	607 Madison, WI	16	5.9%	17.6%	52.9%	11.8%	11.8%	17.6%	29.4%	52.9%
12	676 Tomah, WI	47	10.9%	13.0%	47.8%	10.9%	17.4%	19.6%	26.1%	54.3%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	59	17.5%	14.0%	42.1%	12.3%	14.0%	26.3%	22.8%	50.9%
15	589 Kansas City, MO	91	9.9%	9.9%	54.9%	16.5%	8.8%	15.4%	38.5%	46.2%
15	589A5 Topeka, KS	27	11.1%	3.7%	48.1%	22.2%	14.8%	14.8%	33.3%	51.9%
15	589A6 Leavenworth, KS	41	14.6%	2.4%	61.0%	12.2%	9.8%	29.3%	14.6%	56.1%
16	520 Biloxi, MS	181	21.0%	18.8%	43.6%	8.3%	8.3%	31.5%	24.3%	44.2%
16	580 Houston, TX	186	19.4%	17.2%	45.7%	10.8%	7.0%	24.7%	15.1%	60.2%
16	586 Jackson, MS	40	27.5%	12.5%	42.5%	10.0%	7.5%	35.0%	22.5%	42.5%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	134	19.4%	17.2%	50.7%	6.0%	6.7%	22.4%	35.8%	41.8%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	41	14.6%	7.3%	46.3%	9.8%	22.0%	24.4%	22.0%	53.7%
17	549 Dallas, TX	385	12.5%	16.1%	46.6%	10.2%	14.6%	19.3%	13.3%	67.4%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	34	2.9%	5.9%	61.8%	20.6%	8.8%	14.7%	11.8%	73.5%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	111	20.7%	10.8%	43.2%	8.1%	17.1%	24.1%	17.6%	58.3%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	51	17.6%	21.6%	35.3%	13.7%	11.8%	29.4%	19.6%	51.0%
17	674 Temple, TX	257	16.3%	17.9%	41.6%	12.8%	11.3%	31.5%	21.0%	47.5%
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	94	13.8%	23.4%	39.4%	14.9%	8.5%	20.2%	31.9%	47.9%
18	649 Prescott, AZ	56	19.6%	16.1%	35.7%	17.9%	10.7%	23.2%	25.0%	51.8%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	56	12.5%	14.3%	53.6%	14.3%	5.4%	21.4%	28.6%	50.0%
19	554GE Colorado Springs, CO	10	45.5%	18.2%	18.2%	18.2%	0.0%	63.6%	18.2%	18.2%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	21	14.3%	19.0%	38.1%	9.5%	19.0%	28.6%	14.3%	57.1%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	11	9.1%	9.1%	54.5%	9.1%	18.2%	18.2%	54.5%	27.3%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	27	22.2%	7.4%	25.9%	25.9%	18.5%	29.6%	11.1%	59.3%
20	648 Portland, OR	88	20.5%	20.5%	42.0%	9.1%	8.0%	33.0%	23.9%	43.2%
20	653 Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	30.0%	10.0%	40.0%	10.0%	10.0%	30.0%	30.0%	40.0%
20	663A4 American Lake, WA	84	18.3%	18.3%	42.7%	12.2%	8.5%	24.4%	29.3%	46.3%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	12	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	8.3%	8.3%	41.7%	25.0%	33.3%
20	692 White City, OR	122	10.7%	10.7%	41.8%	17.2%	19.7%	14.8%	23.0%	62.3%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	10	20.0%	20.0%	30.0%	20.0%	10.0%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	68	10.3%	8.8%	41.2%	22.1%	17.6%	16.2%	17.6%	66.2%
21	654 Reno, NV	16	6.3%	50.0%	37.5%	0.0%	6.3%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%
21	662 San Francisco, CA	70	17.4%	18.8%	30.4%	11.6%	21.7%	21.7%	24.6%	53.6%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	31	31.0%	20.7%	34.5%	0.0%	13.8%	37.9%	13.8%	48.3%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	73	9.6%	19.2%	46.6%	12.3%	12.3%	17.8%	31.5%	50.7%
22	664 San Diego, CA	42	35.7%	14.3%	33.3%	2.4%	14.3%	45.2%	23.8%	31.0%
22	691 West LA, CA	29	20.7%	10.3%	44.8%	17.2%	6.9%	24.1%	13.8%	62.1%
23	568 Ft. Meade, SD	34	8.8%	8.8%	29.4%	8.8%	44.1%	8.8%	29.4%	61.8%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	81	5.0%	11.3%	45.0%	17.5%	21.3%	12.3%	27.2%	60.5%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	36	27.8%	16.7%	36.1%	11.1%	8.3%	33.3%	25.0%	41.7%
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	12	30.0%	20.0%	20.0%	10.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	256	19.0%	15.7%	44.8%	10.5%	10.1%	25.4%	22.6%	52.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)			18.2%	16.6%	43.3%	11.0%	10.9%	29.8%	19.2%	51.0%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)			18.5%	16.0%	43.4%	11.0%	11.0%	28.8%	21.3%	49.8%
SITE S.D.			9.7%	6.1%	10.2%	5.2%	6.7%	12.3%	9.4%	11.6%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 28. Type of Discharge from CWT/VI by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge %	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements %	Left Before Planned Discharge %	Other†† %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	55.6%	0.0%	33.3%	11.1%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	43.4%	14.0%	38.4%	4.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	52.0%	<b>40.0%</b>	8.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	75.3%	15.3%	4.7%	4.7%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	56.6%	14.2%	24.8%	4.4%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	47.1%	23.5%	25.5%	3.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	74.3%	5.7%	13.3%	6.7%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	50.7%	16.9%	25.4%	7.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	77.8%	9.3%	7.4%	5.6%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	89.4%	6.1%	3.0%	1.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	69.6%	13.0%	15.2%	2.2%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	44.4%	20.5%	30.8%	4.3%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	48.9%	24.5%	11.5%	15.1%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	47.4%	<b>36.8%</b>	10.5%	5.3%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	96.1%	3.2%	0.6%	0.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	55.4%	14.4%	28.8%	1.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	49.1%	24.6%	17.5%	8.8%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	50.0%	9.1%	31.8%	9.1%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	81.5%	11.1%	7.4%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	51.0%	9.4%	38.3%	1.3%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	59.1%	23.7%	12.9%	4.3%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	41.6%	19.3%	29.9%	9.1%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	64.3%	21.4%	14.3%	0.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	73.5%	11.8%	8.8%	5.9%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	77.1%	7.0%	11.5%	4.5%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	63.8%	8.1%	22.1%	6.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	52.5%	15.3%	25.4%	6.8%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	80.2%	15.4%	2.2%	2.2%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	76.5%	5.9%	11.8%	5.9%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	<b>23.5%</b>	<b>64.7%</b>	11.8%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	59.7%	14.3%	22.1%	3.9%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	56.1%	28.1%	13.2%	2.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	42.9%	<b>40.8%</b>	6.1%	10.2%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	64.7%	3.9%	29.4%	2.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	54.2%	18.6%	22.0%	5.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	29.2%	6.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	69.7%	9.1%	21.2%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	59.1%	13.6%	24.2%	3.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	64.3%	22.4%	7.1%	6.1%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	55.0%	7.5%	25.0%	12.5%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	73.1%	9.6%	17.3%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	59.3%	10.2%	20.3%	10.2%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	52.9%	20.6%	25.0%	1.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	44.4%	7.8%	45.6%	2.2%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	<b>35.1%</b>	24.3%	37.8%	2.7%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	53.6%	15.5%	26.8%	4.1%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	27.8%	1.9%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	66.7%	12.1%	11.3%	9.9%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	51.2%	14.9%	32.1%	1.8%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	42.4%	16.2%	25.3%	16.2%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	<b>35.3%</b>	17.6%	11.8%	35.3%

**Table 28 cont. Type of Discharge from CWT/VI by Site for FY03 †**

				Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge %	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements %	Left Before Planned Discharge %	Other†† %
VISN	SITE		N				
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	53.8%	23.1%	7.7%	15.4%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	41.0%	20.5%	28.2%	10.3%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	67.7%	16.1%	12.9%	3.2%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	58.5%	12.3%	21.5%	7.7%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	70.7%	12.7%	13.3%	3.3%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	41.8%	16.5%	23.1%	18.7%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	35.3%	35.3%	29.4%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	36.2%	27.7%	31.9%	4.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	35.6%	47.5%	13.6%	3.4%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	33.0%	27.5%	33.0%	6.6%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	33.3%	25.9%	37.0%	3.7%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	65.9%	24.4%	4.9%	4.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	43.6%	2.2%	49.7%	4.4%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	47.8%	14.0%	30.1%	8.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	50.0%	15.0%	30.0%	5.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	46.3%	24.6%	26.1%	3.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	43.9%	7.3%	41.5%	7.3%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	28.3%	11.7%	56.6%	3.4%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	70.6%	14.7%	14.7%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	47.7%	7.2%	42.3%	2.7%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	23.5%	9.8%	49.0%	17.6%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	38.9%	30.4%	26.1%	4.7%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	30.9%	12.8%	54.3%	2.1%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	80.4%	14.3%	5.4%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	30.4%	32.1%	25.0%	12.5%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	72.7%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	57.1%	19.0%	14.3%	9.5%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	18.2%	9.1%	72.7%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	59.3%	22.2%	11.1%	7.4%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	52.3%	26.1%	14.8%	6.8%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	50.0%	30.0%	20.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	55.4%	27.7%	14.5%	2.4%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	66.7%	25.0%	8.3%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	122	63.1%	9.8%	19.7%	7.4%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	50.0%	0.0%	30.0%	20.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	42.6%	16.2%	35.3%	5.9%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	12.5%	6.3%	81.3%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	57.1%	7.1%	28.6%	7.1%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	61.3%	16.1%	16.1%	6.5%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	58.9%	1.4%	30.1%	9.6%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	61.9%	9.5%	23.8%	4.8%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	44.8%	6.9%	41.4%	6.9%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	41.2%	50.0%	8.8%	0.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	46.9%	23.5%	24.7%	4.9%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	91.7%	5.6%	2.8%	0.0%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	75.0%	0.0%	16.7%	8.3%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	72.3%	14.8%	9.8%	3.1%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				53.6%	16.0%	25.2%	5.2%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				54.1%	17.5%	22.9%	5.5%
SITE S.D.				16.2%	11.2%	14.6%	5.4%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03:

VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

†† Veteran became too ill to work in CWT/VI or other unspecified reason for discharge.

**Table 29. Time Worked and Earnings in CWT/VI by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	Total Mean Hours Worked in CWT/VI	Mean Hours Worked Per Week	Mean # of Weeks Worked	Total Mean Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Weekly Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI ††
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	199.3	21.0	12.7	\$1,289.94	\$117.34	\$6.32
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	918.7	19.0	34.2	\$6,161.36	\$158.04	\$7.89
1	523	Boston, MA	25	1562.9	33.8	41.8	\$11,962.25	\$278.80	\$7.79
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	513.5	18.9	22.9	\$3,827.36	\$140.08	\$7.24
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	393.8	17.7	17.8	\$2,661.93	\$123.20	\$6.90
1	650	Providence, RI	51	735.4	11.4	63.8	\$4,650.18	\$75.31	\$6.25
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	612.0	19.9	27.8	\$4,553.55	\$149.65	\$7.50
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	1003.0	33.4	32.8	\$5,229.53	\$179.46	\$5.26
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	486.5	27.6	19.5	\$2,906.96	\$153.47	\$5.54
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	282.0	33.6	8.8	\$1,457.32	\$178.60	\$5.20
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	963.8	36.0	27.0	\$5,351.61	\$204.05	\$5.43
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	482.2	27.3	16.0	\$2,657.85	\$141.45	\$4.62
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	716.8	34.4	21.2	\$4,512.44	\$220.05	\$6.31
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	1246.6	27.3	38.0	\$7,199.53	\$168.25	\$6.25
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	133.9	34.9	4.6	\$770.54	\$224.75	\$6.10
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	386.6	31.0	12.6	\$2,323.89	\$191.02	\$6.01
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	856.0	28.7	27.3	\$5,134.86	\$179.49	\$6.00
3	632	Northport, NY	44	755.4	30.1	26.0	\$4,269.59	\$176.45	\$5.43
4	529	Butler, PA	27	194.5	19.7	11.2	\$1,018.30	\$105.19	\$5.25
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	336.9	28.6	11.2	\$1,898.86	\$159.16	\$5.40
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	552.1	35.5	15.9	\$3,442.76	\$221.39	\$6.11
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD), PA	197	490.4	28.6	16.1	\$2,696.00	\$152.88	\$5.16
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	398.8	28.2	13.5	\$2,540.57	\$166.47	\$5.78
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	473.6	21.0	23.7	\$2,493.12	\$112.63	\$5.26
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	178.4	24.0	8.6	\$922.86	\$128.96	\$5.20
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	346.5	32.4	10.5	\$1,794.03	\$174.57	\$5.23
5	688	Washington, DC	118	942.1	33.8	27.9	\$5,407.10	\$195.64	\$5.65
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	678.4	35.5	19.9	\$3,633.60	\$191.78	\$5.31
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	585.8	36.5	16.3	\$3,016.94	\$191.77	\$5.15
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	750.0	38.8	20.8	\$3,954.53	\$209.78	\$5.27
6	658	Salem, VA	77	652.9	29.0	26.5	\$3,893.95	\$182.85	\$5.96
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	941.0	36.4	25.6	\$5,222.32	\$199.98	\$5.44
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	523.3	25.2	22.7	\$3,355.39	\$166.15	\$6.06
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	1084.9	29.3	36.7	\$7,047.51	\$197.13	\$6.45
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	705.8	31.1	19.5	\$4,219.95	\$186.91	\$5.76
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	475.7	32.2	15.9	\$3,740.24	\$243.95	\$7.41
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	593.8	35.2	16.7	\$3,236.97	\$194.46	\$5.46
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	626.9	35.3	18.0	\$3,535.20	\$204.35	\$5.68
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	625.1	29.1	25.0	\$2,617.51	\$146.74	\$4.82
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	1189.4	32.9	36.7	\$6,450.80	\$179.39	\$5.31
8	546	Miami, FL	52	624.0	35.3	17.5	\$3,404.85	\$193.87	\$5.37
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	681.6	36.0	18.7	\$3,679.81	\$198.91	\$5.35
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	523.7	26.5	18.4	\$3,288.09	\$171.06	\$6.32
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	633.9	33.3	18.5	\$3,295.50	\$175.57	\$5.23
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	523.5	28.6	16.6	\$2,695.43	\$150.85	\$5.15
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	763.7	32.7	24.3	\$3,917.31	\$173.94	\$5.14
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	619.4	33.4	17.5	\$3,688.17	\$200.14	\$5.80
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	94.4	12.9	9.2	\$489.89	\$73.80	\$5.32
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	218.9	12.0	18.2	\$1,548.23	\$86.88	\$7.03
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	889.8	29.1	27.7	\$5,059.56	\$168.87	\$5.93
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	352.0	19.6	18.5	\$2,463.35	\$138.64	\$6.96

**Table 29. Time Worked and Earnings in CWT/VI by Site for FY03 †**

				Total Mean Hours Worked in CWT/VI	Mean Hours Worked Per Week	Mean # of Weeks Worked	Total Mean Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Weekly Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI ††
VISN	SITE		N						
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	263.1	17.7	14.5	\$1,315.08	\$90.21	\$5.04
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	352.5	27.2	12.2	\$2,474.15	\$203.73	\$7.15
11	550	Danville, IL	31	999.4	32.3	31.9	\$5,598.03	\$184.55	\$5.61
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	889.7	31.5	29.9	\$4,866.52	\$177.57	\$5.46
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	304.9	29.9	10.0	\$1,803.55	\$172.15	\$5.52
12	578	Hines, IL	91	673.7	15.0	34.1	\$3,602.42	\$79.52	\$5.47
12	607	Madison, WI	16	427.9	28.9	15.4	\$3,588.41	\$290.01	\$8.27
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	559.6	23.3	24.2	\$3,843.64	\$167.69	\$7.19
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	766.9	27.1	32.9	\$6,433.07	\$210.52	\$7.86
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	466.9	30.4	14.9	\$2,983.77	\$202.48	\$6.31
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	743.8	26.9	25.0	\$3,984.00	\$141.51	\$5.11
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	726.8	36.7	20.3	\$3,814.71	\$195.65	\$5.25
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	296.4	29.7	10.0	\$1,723.03	\$175.53	\$5.80
16	580	Houston, TX	186	624.4	29.2	21.3	\$3,747.16	\$176.66	\$5.87
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	673.1	37.0	17.6	\$4,013.63	\$218.34	\$5.61
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	412.6	39.1	10.7	\$2,476.43	\$240.46	\$5.94
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	479.5	25.7	18.9	\$2,552.22	\$137.50	\$5.26
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	336.2	14.5	15.4	\$2,058.91	\$87.03	\$5.23
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	520.6	32.6	17.0	\$2,706.15	\$171.56	\$5.21
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	169.6	10.1	15.8	\$928.86	\$51.28	\$4.69
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	650.4	31.5	19.5	\$3,687.18	\$186.06	\$5.68
17	674	Temple, TX	257	228.9	13.1	14.0	\$1,274.97	\$74.78	\$5.38
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	444.5	21.7	21.8	\$2,650.62	\$136.93	\$5.96
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	280.4	23.3	12.2	\$1,648.77	\$159.17	\$6.25
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	827.1	34.8	24.7	\$4,479.84	\$203.77	\$5.77
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	251.0	20.8	10.0	\$1,572.00	\$136.06	\$5.89
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	1223.9	27.4	42.6	\$7,283.24	\$165.00	\$5.93
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	360.0	22.9	14.8	\$2,118.91	\$139.81	\$5.99
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	1020.4	35.6	29.0	\$6,030.74	\$208.51	\$5.77
20	648	Portland, OR	88	532.5	33.2	17.5	\$3,919.69	\$248.60	\$7.28
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	1233.8	28.8	43.2	\$8,137.90	\$191.99	\$6.63
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	386.8	19.5	19.0	\$2,239.24	\$124.96	\$6.19
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	392.9	18.8	20.2	\$3,024.75	\$145.27	\$7.59
20	692	White City, OR	122	369.6	22.7	15.2	\$2,333.76	\$145.01	\$6.48
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	505.1	13.0	34.7	\$3,287.60	\$83.21	\$6.19
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	1055.7	30.5	34.4	\$9,942.71	\$293.59	\$9.54
21	654	Reno, NV	16	47.4	8.8	12.2	\$245.56	\$48.65	\$5.21
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	913.5	25.6	34.5	\$5,872.63	\$171.87	\$6.77
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	1543.3	34.4	54.5	\$9,043.55	\$210.72	\$5.85
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	727.4	22.6	32.5	\$4,521.45	\$141.52	\$6.22
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	300.6	11.7	18.0	\$2,095.71	\$76.16	\$4.86
22	691	West LA, CA	29	821.0	39.6	21.3	\$5,489.55	\$272.04	\$6.67
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	494.5	26.7	20.9	\$2,974.50	\$174.76	\$6.02
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	643.3	33.6	19.9	\$4,071.35	\$216.34	\$6.25
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	901.1	23.8	46.3	\$4,762.47	\$124.02	\$5.26
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	1453.2	25.3	69.6	\$7,986.00	\$145.55	\$5.65
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	250.0	20.3	17.2	\$1,460.42	\$150.77	\$6.50
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				535.4	26.3	20.0	\$3,223.38	\$160.90	\$5.93
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				612.9	27.3	22.6	\$3,706.72	\$167.89	\$5.96
SITE S.D.				315.1	7.4	11.2	\$2,049.35	\$48.88	\$0.85

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO; Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 30a. CWT/VI Workshop Participation by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	Any Workshop Placement %	Workshop on VA Grounds %	Workshop in the Community %	Workshop Placement Only %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	24.8%	13.7%	12.2%	12.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.4%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	98.0%	7.8%	92.2%	78.4%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	9.5%	2.9%	7.6%	2.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	22.2%	22.2%	1.9%	20.4%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	45.5%	42.4%	3.0%	45.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	93.2%	29.9%	64.1%	42.7%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	10.5%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	9.7%	9.0%	0.6%	3.2%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	1.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	4.5%	4.5%	0.0%	4.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	23.7%	0.0%	23.7%	5.4%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	99.5%	99.5%	0.0%	24.9%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	4.2%	3.4%	0.8%	0.8%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	7.7%	7.7%	0.0%	5.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	29.4%	29.4%	0.0%	29.4%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	6.1%	4.4%	1.8%	0.9%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	85.7%	85.7%	0.0%	59.2%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	6.8%	0.0%	6.8%	6.8%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	43.9%	43.9%	0.0%	28.6%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	5.0%	5.0%	0.0%	5.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	8.9%	8.9%	0.0%	3.3%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	33.0%	33.0%	0.0%	3.1%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	85.8%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	4.2%	2.4%	1.8%	0.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	87.9%	87.9%	0.0%	29.3%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	64.7%	47.1%	17.6%	64.7%

**Table 30a cont. CWT/VI Workshop Participation by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Any Workshop Placement %	Workshop on VA Grounds %	Workshop in the Community %	Workshop Placement Only %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	100.0%	100.0%	25.6%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	91.2%	90.1%	12.1%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	63.8%	61.7%	29.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	39.0%	32.2%	27.1%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	85.7%	85.7%	17.6%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	96.3%	96.3%	29.6%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	21.5%	21.0%	8.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	95.1%	95.1%	12.2%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	100.0%	52.2%	61.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	99.1%	5.4%	93.7%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	91.4%	90.7%	61.5%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%
18	666	Sheridan, WY	11	3.6%	1.8%	3.6%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	9.5%	0.0%	9.5%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	66.7%	63.0%	7.4%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	45.8%	45.8%	39.8%
20	692	White City, OR	122	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	19.7%	19.7%	19.7%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	78.6%	54.3%	27.1%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	16.1%	16.1%	16.1%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	57.1%	57.1%	57.1%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	82.4%	76.5%	47.1%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	41.7%	41.7%	11.1%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	50.0%	50.0%	16.7%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	51.6%	51.6%	43.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)			31.8%	25.1%	8.1%	17.6%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)			25.8%	21.0%	5.4%	13.8%
SITE S.D.			35.1%	31.6%	16.8%	21.6%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 30b. CWT/VI Transitional Work Experience Participation by Site for FY03 †**

VISN		SITE	N	Any Transitional Work Experience Placement %	Transitional Work Experience on VA Grounds %	Transitional Work Experience in the Community %	Transitional Work Experience Only %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	100.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	86.7%	21.9%	76.7%	74.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	100.0%	96.0%	12.0%	100.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	98.8%	91.8%	11.8%	98.8%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	49.6%	49.6%	9.7%	0.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	21.6%	17.6%	5.9%	2.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	97.1%	96.2%	22.9%	90.5%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	100.0%	93.0%	9.9%	100.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	79.6%	51.9%	29.6%	77.8%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	54.5%	39.4%	15.2%	54.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	100.0%	97.8%	2.2%	100.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	56.4%	52.1%	6.8%	6.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	89.5%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	96.8%	95.5%	1.3%	90.3%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	98.6%	98.6%	0.0%	98.6%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	95.5%	65.9%	43.2%	95.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	100.0%	97.0%	3.4%	100.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	94.6%	91.4%	19.4%	76.3%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	75.1%	53.3%	27.4%	0.5%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	85.7%	75.0%	17.9%	85.7%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	100.0%	97.1%	2.9%	100.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	100.0%	100.0%	0.6%	100.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	100.0%	99.3%	8.1%	100.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	99.2%	89.0%	28.8%	95.8%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	79.1%	78.0%	12.1%	76.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	70.6%	70.6%	0.0%	70.6%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	100.0%	97.4%	2.6%	97.4%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	99.1%	99.1%	3.5%	93.9%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	40.8%	40.8%	0.0%	14.3%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	98.0%	17.6%	88.2%	98.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	93.2%	59.3%	35.6%	93.2%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	98.0%	36.7%	61.2%	98.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	100.0%	65.2%	40.9%	100.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	71.4%	63.3%	16.3%	56.1%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	95.0%	95.0%	0.0%	95.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	98.3%	98.3%	0.0%	98.3%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	96.7%	95.6%	1.1%	91.1%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	96.9%	96.9%	0.0%	67.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	14.2%	9.9%	8.5%	0.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	99.4%	31.5%	97.6%	95.8%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	70.7%	68.7%	2.0%	12.1%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	35.3%	35.3%	0.0%	35.3%

**Table 30b cont. CWT/VI Transitional Work Experience Participation by Site for FY03 †**

				Any Transitional Work Experience Placement	Transitional Work Experience on VA Grounds	Transitional Work Experience in the Community	Transitional Work Experience Only
VISN	SITE		N	%	%	%	%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	74.4%	71.8%	7.7%	0.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	100.0%	93.5%	9.7%	100.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	100.0%	63.1%	38.5%	100.0%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	99.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	86.8%	86.8%	0.0%	7.7%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	100.0%	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	70.2%	31.9%	51.1%	36.2%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	72.9%	39.0%	45.8%	61.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	82.4%	50.5%	45.1%	14.3%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	70.4%	33.3%	51.9%	3.7%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	100.0%	98.9%	1.1%	99.4%
16	549	Dallas, TX	385	91.9%	88.2%	6.5%	78.5%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	87.8%	87.8%	0.0%	4.9%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	38.7%	36.6%	4.4%	0.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	100.0%	100.0%	14.7%	100.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	35.8%	32.3%	9.7%	5.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	100.0%	98.9%	5.3%	100.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	98.2%	91.1%	7.1%	98.2%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	96.4%	96.4%	0.0%	96.4%
19	463	Anchorage, AK	27	100.0%	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	90.5%	90.5%	0.0%	90.5%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	100.0%	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
19	554G3	Colorado Springs, CO	10	92.6%	55.6%	74.1%	33.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	100.0%	98.9%	1.1%	100.0%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	90.0%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	60.2%	57.8%	3.6%	54.2%
20	692	White City, OR	122	75.0%	8.3%	66.7%	75.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	80.3%	17.2%	63.1%	80.3%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	80.0%	80.0%	0.0%	80.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	100.0%	67.6%	42.6%	100.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	93.8%	93.8%	6.3%	93.8%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	92.9%	87.1%	7.1%	18.6%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	83.9%	58.1%	25.8%	83.9%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	100.0%	100.0%	8.2%	100.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	42.9%	31.0%	11.9%	42.9%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	50.0%	32.4%	20.6%	14.7%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	98.8%	34.6%	66.7%	98.8%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	88.9%	88.9%	2.8%	58.3%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	83.3%	66.7%	33.3%	50.0%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	55.9%	4.7%	51.6%	48.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				82.0%	68.8%	17.6%	67.8%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				85.9%	73.1%	16.8%	74.0%
SITE S.D.				21.7%	29.6%	23.4%	35.2%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 31. Average Work Improvement Score and Improvement in Work Performance Areas by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Average Work Improvement ††	WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS †††					
				Personal Appearance/ Hygiene	Attendance/ Punctuality	Acceptance of Supervision	Ability to Get Along with Co-workers	Productivity	Quality of Production
1 405	White River Junction, VT	18	1.61	58.8%	61.1%	55.6%	38.9%	77.8%	77.8%
1 518	Bedford, MA	279	<b>1.18</b>	23.8%	29.0%	28.2%	27.1%	29.6%	30.0%
1 523	Boston, MA	25	1.40	32.0%	48.0%	44.0%	44.0%	48.0%	48.0%
1 523A5	Brockton, MA	85	1.69	65.1%	76.5%	77.6%	76.5%	82.4%	82.4%
1 631	Northampton, MA	113	1.76	79.6%	80.5%	80.5%	75.2%	77.0%	73.5%
1 650	Providence, RI	51	<b>1.08</b>	37.3%	23.5%	31.4%	35.3%	31.4%	29.4%
1 689	West Haven, CT	105	<b>1.24</b>	42.9%	26.9%	39.0%	31.7%	37.5%	41.3%
2 528	Buffalo, NY	71	<b>1.34</b>	57.7%	43.7%	49.3%	47.9%	45.1%	43.7%
2 528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	1.83	85.4%	87.0%	88.9%	88.9%	92.6%	92.6%
2 528A6	Bath, NY	66	1.70	59.1%	72.7%	74.2%	74.2%	75.8%	75.8%
2 528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	<b>1.29</b>	32.6%	43.5%	45.7%	45.7%	47.8%	47.8%
2 528A8	Albany, NY	117	1.42	40.0%	42.7%	45.3%	47.0%	55.6%	57.3%
3 526	Bronx, NY	140	1.52	98.6%	54.7%	94.2%	97.8%	53.2%	53.2%
3 561	E. Orange, NJ	19	1.44	68.4%	52.6%	52.6%	68.4%	68.4%	68.4%
3 561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	1.98	97.4%	98.1%	98.1%	98.1%	97.4%	98.1%
3 620	Montrose, NY	139	<b>1.22</b>	18.5%	29.5%	30.2%	32.8%	29.5%	30.9%
3 630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	1.41	47.2%	50.9%	55.4%	56.4%	53.7%	54.9%
3 632	Northport, NY	44	1.38	45.5%	45.5%	45.5%	45.5%	40.9%	40.9%
4 529	Butler, PA	27	1.88	81.5%	92.6%	88.9%	88.9%	85.2%	88.9%
4 542	Coatesville, PA	298	1.86	93.3%	86.9%	87.6%	89.3%	88.9%	88.9%
4 595	Lebanon, PA	93	1.90	96.8%	92.5%	89.2%	90.3%	92.5%	93.5%
4 646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	1.90	89.8%	87.8%	92.4%	93.9%	90.9%	93.4%
4 693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	1.63	64.0%	64.3%	71.4%	71.4%	71.4%	71.4%
5 512	Baltimore, MD	34	1.66	76.5%	66.7%	79.4%	67.6%	79.4%	70.6%
5 512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	1.70	70.7%	70.7%	70.7%	70.7%	72.0%	72.0%
5 613	Martinsburg, WV	149	1.75	83.9%	73.2%	77.2%	77.2%	74.5%	76.5%
5 688	Washington, DC	118	1.46	69.0%	55.1%	62.7%	60.2%	57.6%	59.3%
6 590	Hampton, VA	91	1.94	93.4%	94.5%	94.5%	94.5%	94.5%	94.5%
6 637	Asheville, NC	17	1.82	76.5%	76.5%	82.4%	82.4%	88.2%	88.2%
6 652	Richmond, VA	17	1.58	52.9%	58.8%	58.8%	58.8%	64.7%	64.7%
6 658	Salem, VA	77	1.92	97.4%	93.5%	97.4%	94.8%	81.8%	85.7%
7 508	Atlanta, GA	114	1.49	100.0%	68.4%	69.3%	70.2%	67.5%	68.4%
7 509	Augusta, GA	49	1.71	59.2%	61.2%	79.6%	69.4%	85.7%	83.7%
7 521	Birmingham, AL	51	1.87	98.0%	84.3%	84.3%	90.2%	82.4%	82.4%
7 534	Charleston, SC	59	1.85	94.9%	79.7%	86.4%	81.4%	86.4%	86.4%
7 544	Columbia, SC	49	<b>1.26</b>	46.9%	36.7%	40.8%	50.0%	57.1%	57.1%
7 557	Dublin, GA	34	1.97	100.0%	90.9%	97.0%	97.0%	97.0%	100.0%
7 619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	2.00	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
7 679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	1.73	87.8%	68.4%	80.6%	78.6%	76.3%	77.6%
8 516	Bay Pines, FL	80	1.64	66.3%	60.0%	81.3%	82.5%	67.5%	68.8%
8 546	Miami, FL	52	1.74	80.8%	67.3%	78.8%	82.7%	76.9%	78.8%
8 548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	1.63	72.4%	69.5%	72.9%	69.5%	66.1%	66.1%
8 573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	1.70	76.1%	74.6%	70.1%	63.2%	43.5%	56.5%
8 673	Tampa, FL	90	1.64	36.4%	69.4%	76.5%	74.5%	77.8%	77.8%
9 614	Memphis, TN	37	1.58	58.3%	59.5%	59.5%	56.8%	59.5%	59.5%
9 621	Mountain Home, TN	97	1.90	90.6%	88.5%	92.7%	88.5%	90.6%	90.6%
9 626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	<b>1.30</b>	42.6%	37.0%	38.9%	44.4%	40.7%	40.7%
10 538	Chillicothe, OH	141	1.85	90.7%	84.4%	86.4%	86.4%	83.0%	84.4%
10 539	Cincinnati, OH	168	1.68	66.5%	71.4%	69.6%	69.0%	79.3%	80.0%
10 541	Cleveland, OH	99	1.92	92.9%	90.9%	93.9%	92.9%	91.9%	91.9%
10 552	Dayton, OH	17	1.67	71.4%	76.5%	70.6%	76.5%	70.6%	70.6%

**Table 31 cont. Average Work Improvement Score and Improvement in Work Performance Areas by Site for FY03 †**

			Average Work Improvement ††	WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS †††						
				Personal Appearance/ Hygiene	Attendance/ Punctuality	Acceptance of Supervision	Ability to Get Along with Co- workers	Productivity	Quality of Production	
VISN	SITE	N								
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	1.19	38.5%	38.5%	46.2%	38.5%	41.7%	50.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	1.32	48.7%	48.7%	43.6%	25.6%	38.5%	28.2%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	1.68	74.2%	67.7%	74.2%	64.5%	67.7%	74.2%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	1.38	53.8%	46.2%	44.6%	40.0%	52.3%	52.3%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	1.96	100.0%	93.9%	98.9%	98.9%	97.2%	97.2%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	1.45	68.1%	48.4%	61.5%	63.7%	60.0%	64.4%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	1.59	33.3%	68.8%	52.9%	70.6%	76.5%	76.5%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	1.87	87.5%	87.2%	93.6%	78.7%	91.5%	91.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	1.52	46.4%	52.6%	52.5%	55.2%	56.9%	52.5%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	1.76	79.1%	68.1%	75.8%	71.4%	83.5%	80.2%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	1.19	34.6%	25.9%	25.9%	18.5%	29.6%	29.6%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	1.73	100.0%	82.9%	78.0%	90.2%	73.2%	73.2%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	1.66	76.8%	69.6%	77.3%	77.9%	75.7%	75.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	1.74	81.2%	70.4%	78.0%	78.5%	81.2%	82.3%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	1.18	27.5%	20.0%	30.0%	15.0%	37.5%	27.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	1.50	49.3%	50.7%	50.0%	47.8%	62.7%	61.9%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	1.59	63.4%	65.9%	87.8%	85.4%	73.2%	73.2%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	1.46	57.7%	53.2%	54.0%	54.3%	52.7%	53.0%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	1.88	91.2%	85.3%	91.2%	88.2%	91.2%	94.1%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	1.52	54.1%	53.2%	57.1%	54.1%	54.1%	54.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	1.30	33.3%	42.9%	44.9%	36.0%	53.1%	42.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	1.69	77.3%	72.7%	72.7%	70.2%	72.7%	72.7%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	1.58	67.7%	56.4%	71.0%	73.1%	57.6%	73.9%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	1.64	64.3%	64.3%	64.3%	64.3%	64.3%	64.3%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	1.61	73.2%	62.5%	73.2%	73.2%	64.3%	64.3%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	1.58	45.5%	63.6%	63.6%	63.6%	63.6%	63.6%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	1.68	63.2%	57.9%	71.4%	76.2%	81.0%	76.2%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	1.50	45.5%	54.5%	54.5%	54.5%	45.5%	45.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	1.88	96.3%	77.8%	88.9%	88.9%	88.9%	88.9%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	1.90	95.6%	86.3%	89.0%	93.9%	95.5%	96.6%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	1.83	100.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	1.24	27.7%	35.0%	37.0%	36.7%	46.9%	44.4%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	1.01	8.3%	8.3%	16.7%	25.0%	8.3%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	122	1.80	82.8%	88.5%	82.8%	82.8%	84.4%	83.6%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	1.60	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	1.53	60.7%	61.2%	60.0%	61.2%	65.2%	65.2%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	0.96	37.5%	12.5%	6.3%	12.5%	6.3%	6.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	1.45	58.0%	58.6%	56.5%	61.4%	61.4%	59.4%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	1.69	71.0%	67.7%	67.7%	71.0%	77.4%	77.4%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	1.93	84.9%	89.0%	95.9%	97.3%	95.9%	95.9%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	1.73	80.0%	73.2%	78.6%	78.6%	82.9%	85.4%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	1.53	58.6%	62.1%	64.3%	60.7%	62.1%	62.1%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	1.85	91.2%	94.1%	82.4%	85.3%	91.2%	91.2%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	1.98	100.0%	98.8%	98.8%	97.5%	98.8%	98.8%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	1.63	71.4%	74.3%	66.7%	65.7%	71.4%	68.6%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	1.99	91.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	1.63	56.6%	60.2%	58.8%	57.5%	83.1%	82.3%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				1.63	70.6%	66.6%	70.3%	69.6%	70.4%	70.8%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				1.62	67.8%	65.3%	68.5%	68.0%	69.0%	69.1%
SITE S.D.				0.24	22.7%	20.8%	20.9%	21.5%	20.5%	21.2%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 4, Philadelphia; VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

†† Average Work Improvement score is the mean of the five work performance areas, range 0-2 (0=deteriorated, 1=unchanged, and 2=improved).

††† Improvement is noted for only those veterans with a problem in that category.

**Table 32. Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Alcohol Problems Improved %	Drug Problems Improved %	Non-Substance Abuse Mental Health Problems Improved %	Medical Problems Improved %
1	405 White River Junction, VT	18	57.1%	28.6%	76.5%	75.0%
1	518 Bedford, MA	279	30.9%	28.8%	16.3%	9.1%
1	523 Boston, MA	25	37.5%	40.0%	21.7%	26.1%
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	85	82.7%	79.4%	63.0%	44.3%
1	631 Northampton, MA	113	67.6%	76.7%	60.5%	48.3%
1	650 Providence, RI	51	40.0%	36.7%	40.4%	25.0%
1	689 West Haven, CT	105	29.0%	19.5%	30.4%	8.7%
2	528 Buffalo, NY	71	63.0%	71.7%	35.7%	4.2%
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	54	83.8%	82.4%	73.3%	50.0%
2	528A6 Bath, NY	66	71.2%	71.2%	72.3%	69.7%
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	46	58.8%	61.3%	55.6%	34.3%
2	528A8 Albany, NY	117	47.6%	44.4%	27.3%	8.8%
3	526 Bronx, NY	140	66.7%	56.0%	59.7%	25.0%
3	561 E. Orange, NJ	19	53.3%	63.2%	53.3%	53.8%
3	561A4 Lyons, NJ	155	97.8%	97.1%	97.1%	97.0%
3	620 Montrose, NY	139	32.6%	30.9%	18.3%	1.9%
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	57	63.3%	62.0%	50.0%	40.5%
3	632 Northport, NY	44	70.6%	77.8%	48.1%	46.4%
4	529 Butler, PA	27	96.0%	100.0%	84.6%	36.4%
4	542 Coatesville, PA	298	91.7%	92.6%	73.7%	64.5%
4	595 Lebanon, PA	93	86.5%	88.5%	63.3%	29.2%
4	646A5 Pittsburgh (HD), PA	197	83.0%	86.2%	88.8%	25.2%
4	693 Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	66.7%	66.7%	61.5%	55.6%
5	512 Baltimore, MD	34	60.0%	70.0%	46.2%	23.1%
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	157	86.6%	88.8%	68.0%	7.0%
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	149	76.3%	76.6%	65.2%	69.2%
5	688 Washington, DC	118	67.1%	64.0%	46.3%	50.7%
6	590 Hampton, VA	91	90.7%	90.8%	69.2%	17.6%
6	637 Asheville, NC	17	94.1%	93.8%	87.5%	76.5%
6	652 Richmond, VA	17	20.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%
6	658 Salem, VA	77	81.4%	90.2%	92.3%	71.1%
7	508 Atlanta, GA	114	67.7%	69.5%	51.1%	52.0%
7	509 Augusta, GA	49	36.8%	33.3%	36.4%	9.1%
7	521 Birmingham, AL	51	85.4%	88.1%	84.2%	93.9%
7	534 Charleston, SC	59	79.7%	72.9%	72.9%	64.4%
7	544 Columbia, SC	49	48.5%	45.2%	36.0%	50.0%
7	557 Dublin, GA	34	93.5%	92.0%	81.0%	96.2%
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	66	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	98	69.6%	64.9%	64.4%	31.1%
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	80	65.6%	67.4%	69.0%	60.8%
8	546 Miami, FL	52	79.1%	80.6%	51.4%	0.0%
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	59	73.6%	71.4%	51.7%	2.9%
8	573 Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	56.6%	56.0%	31.3%	21.7%
8	673 Tampa, FL	90	91.5%	89.1%	69.2%	23.9%
9	614 Memphis, TN	37	40.0%	29.6%	28.6%	26.7%
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	97	89.2%	93.0%	83.7%	85.3%
9	626A4 Murfreesboro, TN	54	46.3%	45.1%	16.3%	2.0%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	141	84.4%	80.2%	81.5%	31.3%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	168	67.1%	64.9%	65.8%	62.2%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	99	82.1%	79.8%	82.8%	34.3%
10	552 Dayton, OH	17	60.0%	50.0%	53.3%	53.8%

**Table 32 cont. Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Site for FY03 †**

				Alcohol Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved	Non-Substance Abuse Mental Health Problems Improved	Medical Problems Improved
VISN	SITE		N	%	%	%	%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	11.1%	11.1%	33.3%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	51.3%	41.0%	17.9%	7.7%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	56.0%	63.6%	40.0%	53.3%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	50.0%	50.0%	35.0%	14.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	88.9%	88.7%	73.4%	16.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	63.2%	50.0%	35.7%	16.4%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	93.8%	100.0%	55.6%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	82.9%	69.0%	76.5%	68.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	54.7%	54.2%	59.2%	32.1%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	55.7%	55.7%	59.3%	54.3%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	28.0%	20.0%	5.6%	0.0%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	82.9%	82.9%	82.9%	78.4%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	68.3%	76.1%	62.8%	42.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	56.6%	56.9%	44.7%	17.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	29.4%	18.5%	13.3%	8.1%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	65.8%	67.6%	17.1%	9.1%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	96.4%	81.8%	42.3%	25.9%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	30.5%	27.9%	19.6%	15.2%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	90.3%	83.3%	61.1%	92.3%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	45.2%	46.8%	51.6%	51.6%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	58.6%	52.2%	32.3%	21.4%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	58.8%	56.0%	61.3%	55.9%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	59.3%	54.8%	40.5%	27.7%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	82.1%	90.9%	59.4%	70.8%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	54.9%	50.0%	44.4%	39.4%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	62.5%	50.0%	62.5%	25.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	50.0%	62.5%	57.9%	16.7%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	9.1%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	71.4%	85.7%	73.3%	63.2%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	78.2%	85.0%	87.8%	91.5%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	50.0%	50.0%	66.7%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	39.4%	38.8%	28.2%	29.6%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	16.7%	12.5%	25.0%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	122	87.4%	86.3%	67.7%	84.4%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	50.0%	20.0%	37.5%	14.3%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	60.7%	46.3%	33.3%	31.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	14.3%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	47.1%	54.4%	43.4%	31.4%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	63.0%	65.4%	63.3%	56.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	92.4%	91.8%	84.4%	65.8%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	64.0%	57.1%	45.7%	29.4%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	66.7%	71.4%	62.5%	61.1%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	72.7%	62.5%	75.0%	78.9%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	79.7%	89.7%	90.6%	91.3%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	75.0%	64.3%	64.0%	29.4%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	100.0%	100.0%	91.7%	75.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	71.6%	61.4%	41.5%	27.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)				65.9%	64.5%	52.7%	39.4%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				64.3%	62.4%	54.4%	39.0%
SITE S.D.				21.9%	24.8%	22.7%	28.2%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 33. Employment Status at Discharge by Site for FY03 †**

			Ready for Competitive Employment %	Competitively Employed at Discharge %	Employed in VA's IT %	Student, Trainee or Unpaid Volunteer %	Unemployed %	Retired/ Disabled %	Unknown %	Other %
VISN	SITE	N								
1	405	White River Junction, VT	18	55.6%	55.6%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	27.8%	5.6%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	53.4%	24.4%	0.0%	1.8%	47.7%	8.2%	15.4%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	48.0%	52.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.0%	12.0%	4.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	61.2%	44.7%	0.0%	1.2%	24.7%	5.9%	2.4%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	49.6%	45.1%	2.7%	0.9%	29.2%	7.1%	14.2%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	37.3%	31.4%	0.0%	2.0%	15.7%	33.3%	11.8%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	64.4%	41.9%	1.0%	7.6%	34.3%	10.5%	2.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	59.2%	45.1%	1.4%	4.2%	21.1%	8.5%	14.1%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	77.8%	66.7%	3.7%	1.9%	13.0%	3.7%	3.7%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	90.9%	48.5%	4.5%	6.1%	27.3%	1.5%	10.6%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	69.6%	50.0%	0.0%	8.7%	23.9%	13.0%	4.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	50.4%	51.3%	0.0%	2.6%	23.9%	9.4%	11.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	51.1%	41.0%	0.0%	2.2%	36.7%	14.4%	4.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	57.9%	31.6%	5.3%	0.0%	21.1%	15.8%	15.8%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	96.8%	48.4%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.6%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	60.4%	36.0%	4.3%	2.9%	25.9%	3.6%	20.1%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	47.4%	24.6%	0.0%	12.3%	28.1%	12.3%	15.8%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	43.2%	40.9%	4.5%	6.8%	15.9%	13.6%	11.4%
4	529	Butler, PA	27	88.9%	44.4%	0.0%	0.0%	37.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	298	87.2%	44.6%	0.0%	1.0%	19.8%	4.4%	27.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	93	78.5%	39.8%	0.0%	2.2%	49.5%	4.3%	4.3%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	79.7%	41.6%	0.5%	3.0%	22.8%	12.2%	18.3%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	67.9%	50.0%	0.0%	3.6%	17.9%	14.3%	14.3%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	61.8%	38.2%	8.8%	29.4%	0.0%	14.7%	8.8%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	75.2%	17.2%	3.8%	3.8%	56.1%	10.8%	5.1%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	69.8%	29.5%	1.3%	8.1%	22.1%	14.8%	8.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	56.8%	50.8%	0.0%	6.8%	34.7%	5.9%	1.7%
6	590	Hampton, VA	91	95.5%	70.3%	1.1%	0.0%	24.2%	2.2%	2.2%
6	637	Asheville, NC	17	82.4%	64.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	5.9%	11.8%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	58.8%	29.4%	0.0%	0.0%	70.6%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	49.4%	32.5%	1.3%	0.0%	48.1%	14.3%	2.6%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	114	62.3%	57.0%	0.0%	3.5%	15.8%	6.1%	14.9%
7	509	Augusta, GA	49	34.7%	24.5%	2.0%	4.1%	26.5%	32.7%	8.2%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	51	72.5%	64.7%	0.0%	2.0%	13.7%	5.9%	11.8%
7	534	Charleston, SC	59	76.3%	67.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	10.2%	16.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	49	57.1%	40.8%	0.0%	0.0%	53.1%	2.0%	2.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	78.8%	30.3%	0.0%	6.1%	45.5%	12.1%	6.1%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	86.4%	57.6%	0.0%	4.5%	21.2%	3.0%	12.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	68.4%	45.9%	0.0%	18.4%	5.1%	18.4%	8.2%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	55.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2.5%	16.3%	16.3%	13.8%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	67.3%	50.0%	1.9%	7.7%	19.2%	5.8%	13.5%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	62.7%	61.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	10.2%	25.4%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	80.9%	57.4%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	13.2%	25.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	83.3%	64.4%	0.0%	1.1%	28.9%	2.2%	1.1%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	62.2%	16.2%	0.0%	10.8%	29.7%	10.8%	32.4%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	85.6%	37.1%	5.2%	2.1%	26.8%	4.1%	24.7%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	50.0%	24.1%	0.0%	1.9%	38.9%	14.8%	16.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	141	78.7%	55.3%	2.1%	2.1%	9.2%	19.1%	9.9%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	168	69.0%	44.0%	0.6%	0.6%	20.2%	16.1%	14.9%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	99	49.5%	18.2%	0.0%	15.2%	27.3%	21.2%	18.2%
10	552	Dayton, OH	17	64.7%	35.3%	5.9%	0.0%	17.6%	11.8%	5.9%

**Table 33 cont. Employment Status at Discharge by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Ready for Competitive Employment %	Competitively Employed at Discharge %	Employed in VA's IT %	Student, Trainee or Unpaid Volunteer %	Unemployed %	Retired/ Disabled %	Unknown %	Other %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	53.8%	23.1%	7.7%	7.7%	46.2%	15.4%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	43.6%	35.9%	5.1%	5.1%	15.4%	7.7%	12.8%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	64.5%	51.6%	0.0%	6.5%	12.9%	19.4%	3.2%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	60.0%	40.0%	4.6%	3.1%	13.8%	13.8%	20.0%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	79.6%	54.1%	2.2%	1.1%	37.0%	3.9%	1.1%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	45.1%	31.9%	0.0%	3.3%	23.1%	26.4%	14.3%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	41.2%	47.1%	0.0%	0.0%	41.2%	11.8%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	46.8%	34.0%	0.0%	2.1%	34.0%	14.9%	14.9%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	32.2%	20.3%	5.1%	0.0%	44.1%	15.3%	15.3%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	50.5%	39.6%	0.0%	0.0%	30.8%	11.0%	15.4%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	85.2%	37.0%	0.0%	0.0%	51.9%	3.7%	7.4%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	56.1%	43.9%	2.4%	0.0%	26.8%	7.3%	17.1%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	59.1%	40.9%	0.6%	1.1%	40.9%	8.3%	8.3%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	54.3%	35.5%	0.0%	2.7%	26.9%	13.4%	17.2%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	62.5%	55.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.5%	12.5%	7.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	69.4%	52.2%	0.0%	0.7%	33.6%	5.2%	6.7%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	63.4%	43.9%	0.0%	4.9%	26.8%	7.3%	17.1%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	38.7%	15.8%	0.3%	2.9%	32.5%	10.4%	33.8%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	79.4%	32.4%	11.8%	2.9%	26.5%	5.9%	8.8%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	40.5%	24.3%	1.8%	1.8%	18.9%	24.3%	27.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	52.9%	37.3%	2.0%	2.0%	13.7%	17.6%	25.5%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	86.4%	37.0%	0.4%	1.9%	37.7%	8.6%	12.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	58.5%	34.0%	1.1%	4.3%	9.6%	22.3%	26.6%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	82.1%	50.0%	1.8%	0.0%	48.2%	0.0%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	35.7%	30.4%	0.0%	3.6%	26.8%	17.9%	21.4%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	63.6%	45.5%	0.0%	18.2%	9.1%	27.3%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	66.7%	61.9%	0.0%	4.8%	14.3%	14.3%	4.8%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	27.3%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	63.6%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	70.4%	48.1%	0.0%	7.4%	14.8%	3.7%	22.2%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	71.6%	39.8%	1.1%	9.1%	30.7%	8.0%	10.2%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	60.0%	30.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	10.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	62.7%	25.3%	13.3%	3.6%	45.8%	7.2%	4.8%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	41.7%	41.7%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	8.3%
20	692	White City, OR	122	80.3%	63.1%	1.6%	5.7%	9.8%	9.8%	8.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	60.0%	40.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	20.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	54.4%	41.2%	1.5%	2.9%	26.5%	7.4%	19.1%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%	43.8%	6.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	37.1%	24.3%	0.0%	10.0%	27.1%	18.6%	18.6%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	58.1%	45.2%	3.2%	12.9%	9.7%	19.4%	9.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	39.7%	45.2%	0.0%	21.9%	1.4%	20.5%	9.6%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	21.4%	23.8%	35.7%	4.8%	16.7%	11.9%	7.1%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	55.2%	41.4%	0.0%	0.0%	27.6%	17.2%	10.3%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	55.9%	41.2%	0.0%	5.9%	20.6%	20.6%	5.9%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	92.6%	49.4%	0.0%	3.7%	22.2%	17.3%	3.7%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	80.6%	61.1%	0.0%	2.8%	13.9%	2.8%	16.7%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	41.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	41.7%	8.3%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	75.7%	32.8%	2.0%	0.4%	50.0%	8.2%	5.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)			64.4%	40.2%	1.5%	3.6%	27.4%	10.8%	13.0%	3.7%
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)			61.5%	41.2%	2.1%	4.2%	25.0%	12.2%	11.7%	3.7%
SITE S.D.			17.4%	13.4%	4.9%	5.3%	14.0%	8.4%	9.4%	6.5%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 4, Philadelphia; VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

**Table 34. Housing Status at Discharge by Site for FY03 †**

					Transitional Housing or Halfway House	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary	Homeless / Unknown	Other
VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	%	%	%	%
1	405	<b>White River Junction</b>	18	72.2%	0.0%	5.6%	16.7%	5.6%
1	518	<b>Bedford, MA</b>	279	44.8%	17.2%	3.6%	31.9%	2.5%
1	523	<b>Boston, MA</b>	25	68.0%	0.0%	16.0%	16.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	<b>Brockton, MA</b>	85	27.7%	45.8%	8.4%	15.7%	2.4%
1	631	<b>Northampton, MA</b>	113	17.7%	13.3%	5.3%	63.7%	0.0%
1	650	<b>Providence, RI</b>	51	76.5%	2.0%	5.9%	11.8%	3.9%
1	689	<b>West Haven, CT</b>	105	62.9%	18.1%	10.5%	8.6%	0.0%
2	528	<b>Buffalo, NY</b>	71	87.3%	1.4%	0.0%	8.5%	2.8%
2	528A5	<b>Canandaigua, NY</b>	54	77.8%	14.8%	1.9%	3.7%	1.9%
2	528A6	<b>Bath, NY</b>	66	42.4%	25.8%	16.7%	15.2%	0.0%
2	528A7	<b>Syracuse, NY</b>	46	52.2%	39.1%	0.0%	8.7%	0.0%
2	528A8	<b>Albany, NY</b>	117	59.0%	17.9%	1.7%	20.5%	0.9%
3	526	<b>Bronx, NY</b>	140	69.1%	7.9%	0.7%	17.3%	5.0%
3	561	<b>E. Orange, NJ</b>	19	78.9%	0.0%	5.3%	10.5%	5.3%
3	561A4	<b>Lyons, NJ</b>	155	48.4%	3.2%	48.4%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	<b>Montrose, NY</b>	139	60.4%	2.2%	12.9%	23.0%	1.4%
3	630A4	<b>Brooklyn, NY</b>	57	52.6%	29.8%	1.8%	15.8%	0.0%
3	632	<b>Northport, NY</b>	44	45.5%	34.1%	9.1%	9.1%	2.3%
4	529	<b>Butler, PA</b>	27	51.9%	11.1%	33.3%	3.7%	0.0%
4	542	<b>Coatesville, PA</b>	298	26.8%	10.4%	34.6%	27.5%	0.7%
4	595	<b>Lebanon, PA</b>	93	58.1%	21.5%	8.6%	10.8%	1.1%
4	646A5	<b>Pittsburgh (HD),PA</b>	197	67.5%	5.6%	9.1%	16.8%	1.0%
4	693	<b>Wilkes-Barre, PA</b>	28	42.9%	42.9%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
5	512	<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	34	47.1%	44.1%	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%
5	512A5	<b>Perry Point, MD</b>	157	44.6%	37.6%	7.6%	10.2%	0.0%
5	613	<b>Martinsburg, WV</b>	149	32.2%	18.8%	38.3%	10.7%	0.0%
5	688	<b>Washington, DC</b>	118	61.0%	28.0%	2.5%	8.5%	0.0%
6	590	<b>Hampton, VA</b>	91	53.8%	37.4%	4.4%	3.3%	1.1%
6	637	<b>Asheville, NC</b>	17	47.1%	41.2%	0.0%	5.9%	5.9%
6	652	<b>Richmond, VA</b>	17	76.5%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	<b>Salem, VA</b>	77	62.3%	6.5%	7.8%	22.1%	1.3%
7	508	<b>Atlanta, GA</b>	114	43.9%	28.9%	3.5%	22.8%	0.9%
7	509	<b>Augusta, GA</b>	49	59.2%	6.1%	14.3%	18.4%	2.0%
7	521	<b>Birmingham, AL</b>	51	76.5%	2.0%	2.0%	17.6%	2.0%
7	534	<b>Charleston, SC</b>	59	54.2%	15.3%	1.7%	27.1%	1.7%
7	544	<b>Columbia, SC</b>	49	49.0%	28.6%	0.0%	20.4%	2.0%
7	557	<b>Dublin, GA</b>	34	78.8%	6.1%	9.1%	6.1%	0.0%
7	619A4	<b>Tuskegee, AL</b>	66	80.3%	3.0%	7.6%	9.1%	0.0%
7	679	<b>Tuscaloosa, AL</b>	98	74.5%	9.2%	8.2%	7.1%	1.0%
8	516	<b>Bay Pines, FL</b>	80	67.5%	3.8%	16.3%	11.3%	1.3%
8	546	<b>Miami, FL</b>	52	59.6%	30.8%	3.8%	5.8%	0.0%
8	548	<b>West Palm Beach, FL</b>	59	62.7%	10.2%	0.0%	27.1%	0.0%
8	573	<b>Gainesville/Lake City, FL</b>	68	70.6%	0.0%	0.0%	27.9%	1.5%
8	673	<b>Tampa, FL</b>	90	60.0%	16.7%	2.2%	18.9%	2.2%
9	614	<b>Memphis, TN</b>	37	45.9%	24.3%	0.0%	29.7%	0.0%
9	621	<b>Mountain Home, TN</b>	97	51.5%	1.0%	19.6%	26.8%	1.0%
9	626A4	<b>Murfreesboro, TN</b>	54	37.0%	9.3%	3.7%	48.1%	1.9%
10	538	<b>Chillicothe, OH</b>	141	34.0%	7.8%	45.4%	12.1%	0.7%
10	539	<b>Cincinnati, OH</b>	168	64.3%	4.8%	3.6%	26.2%	1.2%
10	541	<b>Cleveland, OH</b>	99	62.6%	1.0%	7.1%	27.3%	2.0%
10	552	<b>Dayton, OH</b>	17	70.6%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	11.8%

**Table 34 cont. Housing Status at Discharge by Site for FY03 †**

VISN	SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Homeless / Unknown %	Other %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	76.9%	0.0%	7.7%	7.7%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	46.2%	12.8%	15.4%	0.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	77.4%	3.2%	6.5%	6.5%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	75.4%	6.2%	1.5%	15.4%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	30.9%	21.0%	40.9%	6.6%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	60.4%	19.8%	5.5%	14.3%
12	607	Madison, WI	16	70.6%	23.5%	0.0%	5.9%
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	48.9%	27.7%	4.3%	17.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	64.4%	1.7%	13.6%	20.3%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	58.2%	13.2%	6.6%	20.9%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	51.9%	7.4%	7.4%	33.3%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	39.0%	12.2%	24.4%	24.4%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	40.3%	3.9%	38.1%	17.1%
16	580	Houston, TX	186	61.3%	17.2%	2.2%	18.3%
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	70.0%	7.5%	2.5%	20.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	45.5%	6.0%	38.1%	9.7%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	75.6%	0.0%	2.4%	22.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	30.1%	1.8%	10.4%	55.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	47.1%	11.8%	29.4%	11.8%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	46.8%	2.7%	7.2%	42.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	52.9%	17.6%	2.0%	25.5%
17	674	Temple, TX	257	44.0%	0.8%	10.1%	44.4%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	63.8%	6.4%	3.2%	25.5%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	64.3%	17.9%	1.8%	16.1%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	33.9%	35.7%	1.8%	28.6%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	72.7%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	61.9%	19.0%	0.0%	19.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	36.4%	0.0%	18.2%	45.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	55.6%	22.2%	0.0%	14.8%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	67.0%	19.3%	1.1%	11.4%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	90.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	68.7%	9.6%	4.8%	15.7%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	50.0%	33.3%	0.0%	16.7%
20	692	White City, OR	122	32.8%	9.0%	47.5%	10.7%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	70.0%	20.0%	0.0%	10.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	63.2%	16.2%	2.9%	17.6%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	43.8%	18.8%	12.5%	25.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	61.4%	20.0%	1.4%	14.3%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	71.0%	12.9%	3.2%	12.9%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	87.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	71.4%	19.0%	4.8%	4.8%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	51.7%	24.1%	3.4%	20.7%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	67.6%	14.7%	8.8%	8.8%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	66.7%	9.9%	4.9%	13.6%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	83.3%	11.1%	2.8%	2.8%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	83.3%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	60.2%	2.3%	29.7%	6.6%
<b>VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,851)</b>			<b>53.1%</b>	<b>12.6%</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>20.3%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
<b>SITE AVERAGE (N=98)</b>			<b>58.3%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>17.2%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
<b>SITE S.D.</b>			<b>15.4%</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 6, Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

†† Includes own apartment, room or house; apartment, room or house of friend or family member

**Table 35. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY03 †, ††, †††, ††††**

Site Median Value				1.63	79.7%	71.4%	55.6%	27.5%	44.0%	23.9%	8.7%
Veteran Average				1.63	65.9%	64.5%	52.7%	39.4%	40.2%	27.4%	13.0%
					ALCOHOL PROBLEMS	DRUG PROBLEMS	HEALTH PROBLEMS	MEDICAL PROBLEMS	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE	STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE
VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	IMPROVED†††† %	IMPROVED†††† %	IMPROVED†††† %	IMPROVED†††† %	%	%	%
1	405	White River Junction	18	0.03	6.5%	-21.8%	37.9%	59.7%	23.2%	-21.7%	-1.6%
1	518	Bedford, MA	279	-0.46	-41.3%	-43.1%	-43.6%	-19.1%	-17.0%	23.0%	6.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	-0.28	-51.8%	-33.3%	-64.8%	-16.9%	5.4%	8.2%	-4.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	85	0.02	15.9%	11.8%	7.7%	11.4%	2.1%	-0.2%	-6.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	113	0.14	13.8%	21.8%	10.8%	16.6%	4.2%	3.5%	4.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	51	-0.51	-34.7%	-23.8%	-28.8%	-12.0%	-2.7%	-6.2%	4.6%
1	689	West Haven, CT	105	-0.35	-35.0%	-42.5%	-32.1%	-26.3%	6.3%	9.7%	-5.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	71	-0.29	-11.2%	3.0%	-25.3%	-27.9%	4.7%	-2.9%	4.6%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	54	0.15	12.4%	10.8%	17.7%	16.0%	19.6%	-10.7%	-5.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	66	-0.03	8.2%	3.5%	20.2%	39.6%	-1.4%	3.5%	1.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	46	-0.37	-13.0%	-11.5%	0.0%	-3.4%	6.3%	0.8%	-4.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	117	-0.24	-22.9%	-36.9%	-36.1%	-19.7%	10.1%	0.0%	2.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	140	-0.13	0.6%	-29.4%	-9.4%	-56.3%	-0.3%	12.0%	-7.1%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	19	-0.19	-21.1%	-6.4%	-11.8%	12.9%	-10.3%	-3.0%	5.9%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	155	0.26	35.5%	31.8%	44.4%	66.7%	-0.4%	-21.0%	-8.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	139	-0.48	-36.0%	-38.4%	-42.0%	-34.0%	-10.5%	1.2%	10.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	57	-0.20	-9.1%	-16.5%	-18.3%	2.8%	-11.5%	4.5%	6.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	44	-0.25	9.6%	16.4%	-5.0%	9.5%	1.8%	-9.2%	2.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	28	0.18	33.1%	35.8%	26.7%	8.4%	0.7%	13.7%	-8.8%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	27	0.23	35.5%	37.2%	17.8%	34.5%	-0.2%	-5.9%	15.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	298	0.18	15.8%	14.4%	0.7%	-6.1%	-8.6%	25.4%	-4.7%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	93	0.23	11.1%	15.6%	36.2%	-5.2%	-3.9%	-1.1%	9.4%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	197	-0.01	8.7%	3.0%	12.6%	27.3%	6.6%	-7.3%	5.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	34	0.00	-9.1%	3.6%	-15.2%	-8.4%	-4.1%	-25.0%	-1.2%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	157	0.05	30.7%	32.9%	15.8%	-25.6%	-25.8%	31.3%	-4.6%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	149	0.06	6.1%	4.3%	5.5%	36.9%	-14.8%	-0.6%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	118	-0.20	-6.7%	-12.1%	-24.5%	19.0%	7.0%	10.1%	-8.9%
6	590	Hampton, VA	17	0.21	24.0%	19.7%	16.5%	-15.4%	20.0%	0.5%	-6.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	91	0.18	40.6%	38.8%	40.6%	60.2%	20.3%	-14.7%	1.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	17	-0.10	-66.9%	-98.6%	-48.8%	-37.6%	-15.2%	45.4%	-10.3%
6	658	Salem, VA	77	0.29	21.2%	35.9%	50.1%	32.8%	-7.9%	22.1%	-8.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	49	-0.19	-20.0%	-19.0%	-8.8%	20.1%	10.5%	-8.9%	5.3%
7	509	Augusta, GA	34	0.08	-22.6%	-37.1%	-19.5%	-27.0%	-14.4%	3.9%	-0.2%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	114	0.17	28.6%	28.6%	33.1%	65.6%	17.1%	-9.4%	2.5%
7	534	Charleston, SC	49	0.16	17.7%	5.9%	22.2%	37.5%	22.8%	-19.6%	7.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	51	-0.37	-34.0%	-40.5%	-46.0%	11.4%	-3.1%	28.4%	-8.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	59	0.26	29.3%	26.8%	29.1%	66.9%	-18.3%	21.4%	-2.9%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	66	0.37	48.0%	48.5%	52.9%	75.8%	12.5%	-3.1%	1.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	98	0.11	15.9%	3.5%	14.3%	-0.5%	6.8%	-19.3%	-1.8%

**Table 35 cont. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY03 †, ††, †††, ††††**

Site Median Value Veteran Average				1.63 1.63	79.7% 65.9%	71.4% 64.5%	55.6% 52.7%	27.5% 39.4%	44.0% 40.2%	23.9% 27.4%	8.7% 13.0%
				AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS								
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	80	-0.07	-14.6%	-12.8%	7.0%	18.5%	1.2%	-7.6%	5.2%
8	546	Miami, FL	52	0.06	14.3%	10.5%	-7.3%	-29.4%	3.1%	-5.9%	3.6%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	59	-0.08	-0.4%	0.0%	-13.6%	-35.4%	13.2%	-20.1%	15.9%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	0.05	4.5%	-2.4%	-22.5%	-26.9%	13.8%	-23.8%	14.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	90	-0.04	27.4%	18.7%	5.5%	-15.0%	14.2%	5.8%	-8.3%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	-0.09	-15.0%	-26.8%	-19.2%	-9.1%	-28.6%	4.9%	22.3%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	97	0.18	28.7%	26.9%	33.0%	53.9%	-12.3%	3.1%	16.5%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	54	-0.34	-35.3%	-48.4%	-49.9%	-34.4%	-18.4%	13.9%	6.5%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	17	0.22	31.1%	26.1%	36.6%	3.2%	13.2%	-15.3%	0.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	141	0.01	5.2%	-0.3%	17.2%	37.9%	0.0%	-3.4%	6.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	168	0.25	19.7%	13.2%	32.8%	-1.6%	-25.2%	2.1%	7.9%
10	552	Dayton	99	0.02	4.2%	-37.0%	-13.6%	15.5%	-9.1%	-7.2%	-3.1%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	-0.29	-64.4%	-94.8%	-33.3%	-27.3%	-15.0%	22.9%	-7.4%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	-0.32	-13.9%	-26.8%	-45.4%	-22.8%	-7.2%	-11.8%	1.9%
11	550	Danville, IL	31	0.06	-16.1%	-6.9%	-12.0%	33.6%	12.2%	-11.3%	-6.7%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	-0.24	-22.4%	-23.1%	-30.6%	-21.8%	-0.7%	-9.2%	10.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	0.25	20.3%	16.1%	12.5%	-15.5%	5.8%	12.7%	-8.5%
12	578	Hines, IL	91	-0.19	-19.9%	-44.2%	-55.6%	-30.9%	-8.8%	-0.6%	4.9%
12	607	Madison	47	-0.08	31.6%	40.7%	12.1%	-24.0%	3.9%	18.1%	-8.6%
12	676	Tomah, WI	59	0.20	8.4%	-20.3%	15.3%	35.0%	-9.2%	10.3%	6.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	27	-0.16	-14.5%	-10.8%	8.4%	-3.9%	-20.9%	19.3%	4.5%
15	589	Kansas City	41	0.07	-8.1%	-9.1%	8.0%	18.1%	-7.0%	5.5%	6.1%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	181	-0.44	-52.4%	-52.4%	-61.6%	-21.0%	-4.6%	26.3%	-1.5%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	186	0.05	6.7%	3.0%	21.6%	47.0%	0.5%	1.9%	8.1%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	40	0.02	-10.2%	2.7%	-8.1%	0.5%	-3.1%	16.2%	-0.9%
16	580	Houston, TX	134	0.07	-38.3%	-37.0%	-21.8%	-16.6%	-8.3%	3.6%	8.4%
16	586	Jackson, MS	41	-0.47	-53.7%	-72.7%	-40.0%	-30.5%	10.9%	-2.7%	-3.1%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	385	-0.23	-14.0%	-16.5%	-37.5%	-23.8%	2.2%	9.7%	-2.3%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	34	-0.07	35.6%	7.0%	-22.8%	-12.8%	-0.1%	2.0%	8.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	111	-0.18	-25.7%	-39.6%	-40.0%	-15.4%	-25.1%	6.3%	22.5%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	51	0.16	26.6%	4.9%	9.2%	62.7%	-15.0%	2.6%	-0.1%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	257	-0.08	-9.7%	-8.7%	3.6%	27.5%	-12.5%	-6.5%	15.8%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	94	-0.33	-5.3%	-27.5%	-37.9%	-26.1%	-6.6%	-10.4%	16.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	56	0.03	-13.8%	-13.4%	6.2%	25.4%	-9.0%	12.8%	4.2%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	56	-0.06	-37.8%	-32.6%	-36.5%	3.8%	-9.2%	-13.6%	18.6%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	21	0.00	10.0%	25.0%	9.0%	43.8%	8.1%	25.3%	-7.5%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	27	-0.11	-27.6%	-33.1%	-32.0%	-19.0%	-19.1%	2.3%	13.6%
19	554GE	Colorado Springs	88	-0.12	-28.5%	-29.7%	-4.8%	-0.5%	4.8%	-15.3%	-7.9%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	84	0.03	-45.7%	-26.1%	-2.9%	-14.4%	14.8%	-9.6%	-3.1%
19	666	Sheridan	122	-0.11	-90.5%	-49.4%	-23.2%	-13.7%	-17.2%	-25.8%	53.0%

**Table 35 cont. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY03 †, ††, †††, ††††**

Site Median Value Veteran Average				1.63	79.7%	71.4%	55.6%	27.5%	44.0%	23.9%	8.7%
				1.63	65.9%	64.5%	52.7%	39.4%	40.2%	27.4%	13.0%
VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
20	463	Anchorage, AK	16	0.18	2.1%	23.2%	12.5%	29.8%	0.3%	-8.6%	14.4%
20	648	Portland, OR	91	0.24	7.0%	20.2%	39.5%	65.5%	-7.3%	7.3%	2.5%
20	653	Roseburg	10	0.21	-37.9%	-3.8%	11.8%	-42.5%	-11.3%	-4.5%	2.7%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	11	-0.41	-25.5%	-34.1%	-28.6%	-2.8%	-19.8%	23.5%	-2.3%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	10	-0.63	-67.8%	-53.2%	-16.4%	-35.1%	-2.8%	-0.3%	-0.7%
20	692	White City, OR	122	0.08	18.9%	17.3%	6.3%	49.2%	14.3%	-13.5%	0.1%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	0.13	-8.7%	-53.8%	-28.5%	-51.0%	1.2%	-13.2%	-8.1%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	-0.14	-13.1%	-27.1%	-27.4%	-3.0%	-3.1%	0.9%	10.7%
21	654	Reno, NV	16	-0.65	-83.6%	-66.6%	-58.2%	-34.5%	-33.0%	10.7%	-1.8%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	-0.18	-24.9%	-17.1%	-23.1%	-5.8%	-9.5%	5.1%	10.5%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	0.07	1.2%	-7.1%	15.3%	33.0%	7.4%	-11.5%	2.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	0.29	30.1%	26.9%	35.5%	24.1%	5.5%	-21.8%	0.7%
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	0.12	0.4%	-14.9%	-10.0%	-2.7%	-11.2%	-2.7%	0.5%
22	691	West LA, CA	29	-0.09	4.3%	3.4%	11.1%	29.6%	-0.2%	1.3%	0.9%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	0.19	-6.6%	3.2%	26.5%	57.7%	-1.4%	-2.5%	-2.6%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	0.28	0.0%	17.4%	44.4%	59.8%	4.5%	-0.9%	-4.0%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	-0.03	7.1%	-3.1%	10.9%	-3.3%	17.5%	-8.5%	9.0%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	0.40	47.4%	45.7%	52.0%	57.9%	3.3%	-3.9%	1.7%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	0.00	7.9%	-0.1%	-2.7%	0.0%	-8.1%	25.3%	-3.9%

† Outcomes have been adjusted for the following veteran characteristics: Age, race, marital status, education, previous employment history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses; including serious psychiatric illness and substance abuse problems.

†† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY03: VISN 4, Philadelphia; VISN 6, Durham and Salisbury; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 22, Sepulveda and VISN 23, Fargo.

††† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

**Table 36. Summary of Outliers by Site for FY03**

VISN			SITE	N	VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC CRITICAL MONITOR	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
1	405		White River Junction, VT	18	0	0	0	0
1	518		Bedford, MA	279	0	2	8	10
1	523		Boston, MA	25	0	1	3	4
1	523A5		Brockton, MA	85	0	1	0	1
1	631		Northampton, MA	113	0	1	0	1
1	650		Providence, RI	51	0	2	2	4
1	689		West Haven, CT	105	0	1	5	6
2	528		Buffalo, NY	71	0	1	2	3
2	528A5		Canandaigua, NY	54	0	0	0	0
2	528A6		Bath, NY	66	0	0	0	0
2	528A7		Syracuse, NY	46	0	1	1	2
2	528A8		Albany, NY	117	0	1	5	6
3	526		Bronx, NY	140	0	0	4	4
3	561		E. Orange, NJ	19	1	1	0	2
3	561A4		Lyons, NJ	155	0	0	0	0
3	620		Montrose, NY	139	0	1	6	7
3	630A4		Brooklyn, NY	57	0	0	1	1
3	632		Northport, NY	44	0	0	1	1
4	529		Butler, PA	27	0	1	0	1
4	542		Coatesville, PA	298	1	0	1	2
4	595		Lebanon, PA	93	0	0	1	1
4	646A5		Pittsburgh (HD),PA	197	0	0	1	1
4	693		Wilkes-Barre, PA	28	0	0	0	0
5	512		Baltimore, MD	34	0	0	0	0
5	512A5		Perry Point, MD	157	0	0	3	3
5	613		Martinsburg, WV	149	0	0	1	1
5	688		Washington, DC	118	0	0	1	1
6	590		Hampton, VA	91	1	0	0	1
6	637		Asheville, NC	17	0	0	0	0
6	652		Richmond, VA	17	0	2	5	7
6	658		Salem, VA	77	1	0	1	2
7	508		Atlanta, GA	114	0	0	1	1
7	509		Augusta, GA	49	0	1	2	3
7	521		Birmingham, AL	51	1	0	0	1
7	534		Charleston, SC	59	0	0	0	0
7	544		Columbia, SC	49	1	2	5	8
7	557		Dublin, GA	34	0	0	2	2
7	619A4		Tuskegee, AL	66	1	0	0	1
7	679		Tuscaloosa, AL	98	0	1	0	1
8	516		Bay Pines, FL	80	1	0	0	1
8	546		Miami, FL	52	0	0	1	1
8	548		West Palm Beach, FL	59	0	0	2	2
8	573		Gainesville/Lake City, FL	68	0	0	2	2
8	673		Tampa, FL	90	1	0	0	1
9	614		Memphis, TN	37	1	1	2	4
9	621		Mountain Home, TN	97	0	0	2	2
9	626A4		Murfreesboro, TN	54	0	3	7	10
10	538		Chillicothe, OH	141	0	1	0	1
10	539		Cincinnati, OH	168	0	1	0	1
10	541		Cleveland, OH	99	0	0	1	1
10	552		Dayton, OH	17	0	2	0	2

Table 36 cont. Summary of Outliers by Site for FY03

VISN		SITE	N	VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC CRITICAL MONITOR	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	13	0	3	4	7
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	39	0	1	3	4
11	550	Danville, IL	31	0	0	0	0
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	65	0	0	3	3
12	556	North Chicago, IL	181	1	0	2	3
12	578	Hines, IL	91	0	1	4	5
12	607	Madison, WI	16	0	2	0	2
12	676	Tomah, WI	47	0	1	0	1
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	59	0	2	3	5
15	589	Kansas City, MO	91	0	1	0	1
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	27	0	2	5	7
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	41	0	0	0	0
16	520	Biloxi, MS	181	0	0	1	1
16	580	Houston, TX	186	0	0	4	4
16	586	Jackson, MS	40	0	1	5	6
16	598	Little Rock, AR	134	1	0	3	4
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	41	0	0	0	0
17	549	Dallas, TX	385	0	2	7	9
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	34	0	0	0	0
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	111	0	2	2	4
17	671	San Antonio, TX	51	0	2	4	6
17	674	Temple, TX	257	0	2	1	3
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	94	0	1	4	5
18	649	Prescott, AZ	56	0	0	1	1
18	678	Tucson, AZ	56	0	2	5	7
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO	10	0	0	0	0
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	21	0	0	1	1
19	666	Sheridan, WY	11	0	1	3	4
20	463	Anchorage, AK	27	1	0	1	2
20	648	Portland, OR	88	0	0	0	0
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	10	0	1	0	1
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	84	0	2	4	6
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	12	1	2	3	6
20	692	White City, OR	122	0	0	0	0
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	0	1	1	2
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	68	1	0	3	4
21	654	Reno, NV	16	0	3	6	9
21	662	San Francisco, CA	70	0	0	3	3
22	600	Long Beach, CA	31	0	0	0	0
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	73	0	0	0	0
22	664	San Diego, CA	42	0	2	0	2
22	691	West LA, CA	29	0	0	0	0
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	34	0	1	0	1
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	81	0	0	0	0
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	36	0	0	0	0
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	12	0	0	0	0
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	256	0	0	1	1
SITE AVERAGE (N=98)				0.2	0.7	1.7	2.5
SITE S.D.				0.3	0.9	2.0	2.6

Table 37a. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement	FY02 Average Work Improvement	FY03 Average Work Improvement
1	405 White River Jct., VT	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	***	***	0.03
1	518 Bedford, MA	<b>-0.41</b>	-0.39	<b>-0.27</b>	<b>-0.34</b>	<b>-0.43</b>	<b>-0.49</b>	<b>-0.46</b>
1	523 Boston, MA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-0.23</b>	-0.16	0.09	<b>-0.28</b>
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	0.18	0.08	-0.05	<b>-0.21</b>	<b>-0.43</b>	<b>-0.36</b>	0.02
1	608 Manchester, NH	<b>-0.43</b>	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
1	631 Northampton, MA	0.03	0.09	0.03	0.07	0.22	0.29	0.14
1	650 Providence, RI	-0.12	-0.08	-0.09	0.08	0.24	<b>-0.42</b>	<b>-0.51</b>
1	689 West Haven, CT	-0.01	-0.11	0.21	-0.04	0.06	<b>-0.46</b>	<b>-0.35</b>
2	528 Buffalo, NY	<b>-0.42</b>	<b>-0.50</b>	<b>-0.54</b>	<b>-0.47</b>	<b>-0.41</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-0.29</b>
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	0.00	<b>-0.19</b>	-0.01	0.08	-0.02	0.00	0.15
2	528A6 Bath, NY	0.48	0.42	0.39	0.19	0.22	0.32	-0.03
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	0.08	0.03	<b>-0.24</b>	0.00	<b>-0.44</b>	<b>-0.51</b>	<b>-0.37</b>
2	528A8 Albany, NY	<b>-0.34</b>	<b>-0.22</b>	-0.09	0.04	-0.11	<b>-0.25</b>	<b>-0.24</b>
3	526 Bronx, NY	0.01	0.42	0.07	0.15	0.08	-0.10	<b>-0.13</b>
3	561 New Jersey HCS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	-0.01	0.01	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>
3	561A East Orange, NJ	-0.08	0.23	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	0.30	0.28	-0.19
3	561B Lyons, NJ	0.12	0.28	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	0.32	0.32	0.26
3	620 Montrose, NY	<b>-0.35</b>	-0.10	<b>-0.16</b>	-0.11	<b>-0.39</b>	<b>-0.45</b>	<b>-0.48</b>
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	<i>n.a.</i>	-0.08	-0.10	<b>-0.23</b>	<b>-0.38</b>	<b>-0.20</b>	<b>-0.20</b>
3	632 Northport, NY	0.08	0.23	0.10	***	<b>-0.22</b>	-0.01	<b>-0.25</b>
4	529 Butler, PA	***	0.24	0.36	0.37	0.29	0.34	0.18
4	542 Coatesville, PA	0.04	0.24	0.31	0.27	0.26	0.24	0.23
4	595 Lebanon, PA	0.07	0.00	0.10	0.17	0.25	0.29	0.18
4	642 Philadelphia, PA	***	0.46	0.46	0.42	0.39	0.40	<i>program closed</i>
4	656A5 Pittsburgh, PA	<b>-0.59</b>	<b>-0.14</b>	0.05	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.23
4	693 Wilkes Barre, PA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-0.20	-0.01
5	512 Baltimore, MD	***	0.17	0.32	-0.03	0.29	0.06	0.00
5	512A4 Fort Howard, MD	<i>n.a.</i>	***	0.02	0.08	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	0.10	-0.12	0.25	***	-0.07	0.12	0.05
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-0.08	0.01	0.20	0.26	0.06
5	688 Washington DC	<b>-0.54</b>	<b>-0.31</b>	-0.13	<b>-0.28</b>	-0.16	-0.10	<b>-0.20</b>
6	558 Durham, NC	0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.23	0.25	***	<i>program closed</i>
6	590 Hampton, VA	0.18	-0.06	0.11	0.11	0.24	0.27	0.21
6	637 Asheville, NC	***	***	***	***	-0.05	-0.04	0.18
6	652 Richmond, VA	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-0.28</b>	-0.01	<i>program closed</i>	***	<b>-0.52</b>	-0.10
6	658 Salem, VA	<b>-0.36</b>	<b>-0.62</b>	0.16	0.28	0.33	0.21	0.29
6	659 Salisbury, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***
7	508 Atlanta, GA	<b>0.16</b>	<b>-0.23</b>	<b>-0.37</b>	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>-0.32</b>	-0.09	<b>-0.19</b>
7	509 Augusta, GA	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.08
7	521 Birmingham, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	0.38	0.25	0.24	0.19	0.17
7	534 Charleston, SC	<b>-0.21</b>	0.09	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.12	0.16
7	544 Columbia, SC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	<b>-0.22</b>	<b>-0.37</b>
7	557 Dublin, GA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	0.09	***	0.31	0.26
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-0.24</b>	-0.08	0.37
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	-0.05	0.11	0.02	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.11

Table 37a cont. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement	FY02 Average Work Improvement	FY03 Average Work Improvement
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	-0.12	0.34	0.30	-0.05	-0.06	-0.09	-0.07
8	546 Miami, FL	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.06
8	548 W. Palm Beach, FL	<i>n.a.</i>	***	<b>-0.34</b>	<b>-0.24</b>	-0.09	-0.18	-0.08
8	573 N.FL/S.GA VHS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	0.29	0.07	0.14	0.16	0.05
8	573A Gainesville, FL	***	0.27	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>
8	573B Lake City, FL	***	0.13	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>
8	673 Tampa, FL	0.00	0.07	-0.03	0.02	<b>-0.46</b>	<b>-0.34</b>	-0.04
9	596 Lexington, KY	<b>-0.39</b>	<b>-0.45</b>	<b>-0.57</b>	<b>-0.44</b>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
9	614 Memphis, TN	***	0.24	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.21	-0.09
9	621 Mt. Home, TN	-0.03	0.10	0.08	0.02	0.24	0.30	0.18
9	622 Murfreesboro, TN	<b>-0.43</b>	<b>-0.48</b>	<b>-0.48</b>	<b>-0.44</b>	<b>-0.49</b>	<b>-0.35</b>	<b>-0.34</b>
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	0.00	0.02	<b>-0.20</b>	<b>-0.25</b>	<b>-0.31</b>	0.27	0.22
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	0.31	0.17	0.01
10	541 Cleveland, OH	0.28	0.13	0.09	0.21	0.25	0.24	0.25
10	552 Dayton, OH	<b>-0.54</b>	***	-0.15	<b>-0.32</b>	***	-0.08	0.02
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	<b>-0.65</b>	<b>-0.29</b>
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	-0.07	-0.05	<b>-0.17</b>	<b>-0.21</b>	<b>-0.22</b>	<b>-0.40</b>	<b>-0.32</b>
11	550 Danville, IL	-0.16	***	-0.10	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>-0.24</b>	-0.03	0.06
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	<i>n.a.</i>	0.24	-0.18	-0.19	-0.19	<b>-0.25</b>	<b>-0.24</b>
12	556 North Chicago, IL	-0.06	***	0.27	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.25
12	578 Hines, IL	-0.14	<b>-0.59</b>	<b>-0.34</b>	<b>-0.28</b>	<b>-0.19</b>	-0.12	<b>-0.19</b>
12	585 Iron Mountain, MI	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
12	607 Madison, WI	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-0.08
12	676 Tomah, WI	-0.11	0.02	0.07	<b>-0.59</b>	0.28	0.17	0.20
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	<b>-0.29</b>	0.02	0.10	-0.07	-0.03	0.01	<b>-0.16</b>
15	543 Columbia, MO	***	***	<b>-0.78</b>	***	***	***	***
15	589 Kansas City, KS	<b>-0.29</b>	0.39	0.43	0.41	***	***	0.07
15	647 Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-0.07	***	***	***	***	***
15	657 St. Louis, MO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***
15	677 Topeka, KS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	-0.19	<b>-0.38</b>	<b>-0.44</b>
15	677A4 Leavenworth, KS	-0.13	<b>-0.40</b>	0.24	0.21	0.28	0.22	0.05
16	520 Biloxi, MI	-0.16	-0.07	-0.09	-0.01	-0.11	-0.09	0.02
16	580 Houston, TX	<b>-0.40</b>	0.32	0.26	0.27	0.21	0.05	0.07
16	586 Jackson, MS	***	-0.05	-0.05	0.17	0.05	<b>-0.38</b>	<b>-0.47</b>
16	598 Little Rock, AR	<b>-0.68</b>	<b>-0.19</b>	<b>-0.28</b>	<b>-0.31</b>	<b>-0.14</b>	<b>-0.15</b>	<b>-0.23</b>
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	-0.08	-0.14	***	<b>-0.28</b>	<b>-0.23</b>	-0.04	-0.07
17	549 Dallas, TX	-0.08	0.08	-0.03	-0.10	-0.10	-0.12	<b>-0.18</b>
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	<i>n.a.</i>	0.23	0.25	0.26	0.19	0.22	0.16
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-0.16	-0.11	-0.08
17	671 San Antonio, TX	0.35	0.21	0.05	0.13	-0.18	-0.10	<b>-0.33</b>
17	674 Temple, TX	-0.09	0.06	-0.03	0.23	0.30	-0.04	0.03
17	674A4 Waco, TX	0.26	<b>-0.22</b>	***	***	0.27	***	<i>program closed</i>

**Table 37a cont. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

VISN	SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement	FY02 Average Work Improvement	FY03 Average Work Improvement
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	<b>-0.33</b>	0.17	-0.06
18	644 Phoenix, AZ	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-0.09	0.18	0.00	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
18	649 Prescott, AZ	0.21	0.11	0.22	-0.03	0.11	0.13	0.00
18	678 Tucson, AZ	-0.09	-0.22	-0.02	0.01	-0.16	0.02	-0.11
18	756 El Paso	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE Col. Springs, CO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-0.12
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	0.22	0.23	0.25	0.15	<b>-0.21</b>	0.04	0.03
19	666 Sheridan, WY	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-0.37</b>	<b>-0.33</b>	0.32	***	***	-0.11
20	463 Anchorage, AK	<b>-0.37</b>	-0.01	-0.02	0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.18
20	648 Portland, OR	-0.03	0.20	0.37	0.35	0.31	0.25	0.24
20	653 Roseburg, OR	<b>-0.30</b>	-0.23	-0.05	0.10	<b>-0.27</b>	***	0.21
20	663 Seattle, WA	-0.20	<b>-0.30</b>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
20	663A4 Am. Lake, WA	0.00	-0.05	0.19	-0.03	-0.14	<b>-0.35</b>	<b>-0.41</b>
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-0.55</b>	<b>-0.63</b>
20	692 White City, OR	-0.11	-0.03	-0.03	0.14	0.14	0.19	0.08
21	459 Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	0.21	-0.25	0.07	0.13
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	***	<b>-0.28</b>	-0.17	-0.07	-0.01	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>-0.14</b>
21	654 Reno, NV	***	***	***	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-0.55</b>	***	<b>-0.65</b>
21	662 San Francisco, CA	-0.13	<b>-0.35</b>	-0.15	<b>-0.28</b>	<b>-0.51</b>	<b>-0.32</b>	<b>-0.18</b>
22	600 Long Beach, CA	-0.08	0.26	0.26	0.08	0.25	0.19	0.07
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	0.37	0.31	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.29
22	664 San Diego, CA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-0.18	-0.02	0.07	0.25	0.12
22	691 West LA, CA	***	***	-0.13	0.10	***	0.00	-0.09
22	691A4 Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437 Fargo, ND						<i>n.a.</i>	***
23	438 Sioux Falls, SD	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-0.05	-0.19	***
23	568 Fort Meade, SD	-0.02	<b>-0.39</b>	0.39	0.44	0.37	0.30	0.19
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	0.46	0.42	0.30	0.36	0.29	0.25	0.28
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-0.09	<b>-0.34</b>	<b>-0.57</b>	-0.03
23	636A6 Des Moines, IA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	0.06	0.19	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	-0.08	<b>-0.41</b>	0.04	0.30	0.39	0.30	0.40
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.01	-0.13	-0.03	0.00

† Average work improvement has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

\*\*\* Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

**Table 37b. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year†, ††**

VISN	SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY02 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY03 Alcohol Problems Improved %
1	405 White River Jct., VT	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	***	***	6.5%
1	518 Bedford, MA	<b>-32.0%</b>	<b>-32.0%</b>	<b>-26.6%</b>	<b>-32.8%</b>	<b>-34.2%</b>	<b>-46.0%</b>	<b>-41.3%</b>
1	523 Boston, MA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-69.3%</b>	<b>-27.4%</b>	-28.9%	<b>-51.8%</b>
1	523A5 Brockton, MA	31.1%	22.6%	-2.9%	0.0%	1.2%	-20.4%	15.9%
1	608 Manchester, NH	-30.1%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
1	631 Northampton, MA	1.1%	6.1%	4.2%	12.9%	14.0%	14.9%	13.8%
1	650 Providence, RI	18.2%	-5.5%	<b>-32.7%</b>	24.8%	24.3%	-30.1%	<b>-34.7%</b>
1	689 West Haven, CT	<b>-29.2%</b>	-20.4%	27.4%	1.8%	8.8%	<b>-47.2%</b>	<b>-35.0%</b>
2	528 Buffalo, NY	-17.0%	-21.6%	<b>-54.6%</b>	-19.0%	-13.7%	<b>-35.0%</b>	-11.2%
2	528A5 Canandaigua, NY	40.7%	0.0%	4.7%	22.8%	-16.5%	5.1%	12.4%
2	528A6 Bath, NY	20.7%	65.9%	46.2%	38.7%	33.7%	38.7%	8.2%
2	528A7 Syracuse, NY	-19.4%	21.0%	<b>-42.7%</b>	1.2%	<b>-41.0%</b>	<b>-54.0%</b>	-13.0%
2	528A8 Albany, NY	<b>-35.6%</b>	-9.3%	-7.3%	-9.1%	-11.4%	<b>-27.6%</b>	<b>-22.9%</b>
3	526 Bronx, NY	-43.6%	38.8%	8.9%	15.1%	16.1%	9.0%	0.6%
3	561 New Jersey HCS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	21.1%	-5.0%	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>
3	561A East Orange, NJ	-24.1%	48.0%	<i>see above</i>	15.9%	24.7%	23.5%	-21.1%
3	561B Lyons, NJ	9.2%	55.5%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	13.6%	33.2%	35.5%
3	620 Montrose, NY	-23.9%	0.8%	-2.8%	<i>see above</i>	<b>-29.5%</b>	<b>-37.2%</b>	<b>-36.0%</b>
3	630A4 Brooklyn, NY	***	-3.4%	6.6%	-4.3%	<b>-26.1%</b>	<b>-45.6%</b>	-9.1%
3	632 Northport, NY	-17.1%	29.8%	-1.6%	***	-11.3%	-19.7%	9.6%
4	529 Butler, PA	***	54.9%	52.7%	44.3%	47.1%	42.5%	33.1%
4	542 Coatesville, PA	27.5%	46.7%	39.8%	42.1%	35.6%	33.2%	35.5%
4	595 Lebanon, PA	0.0%	15.3%	28.5%	22.8%	30.4%	32.9%	15.8%
4	642 Philadelphia, PA	***	61.3%	57.4%	35.7%	22.3%	43.3%	<i>program closed</i>
4	656A5 Pittsburgh, PA	<b>-42.0%</b>	9.6%	14.9%	5.3%	13.6%	-12.7%	11.1%
4	693 Wilkes Barre, PA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	0.0%	8.7%
5	512 Baltimore, MD	***	25.5%	31.2%	7.5%	-24.5%	9.5%	-9.1%
5	512A4 Fort Howard, MD	<i>n.a.</i>	***	16.3%	14.8%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
5	512A5 Perry Point, MD	34.4%	-6.8%	27.5%	***	40.3%	36.9%	30.7%
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	***	***	1.2%	4.5%	18.3%	29.3%	6.1%
5	688 Washington DC	<b>-39.3%</b>	-5.1%	-1.4%	<b>-25.3%</b>	-5.8%	<b>-40.7%</b>	-6.7%
6	558 Durham, NC	55.0%	15.8%	14.2%	***	16.2%	***	<i>program closed</i>
6	590 Hampton, VA	11.5%	-0.7%	7.5%	3.2%	27.1%	13.9%	24.0%
6	637 Asheville, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-15.2%	-35.0%	40.6%
6	652 Richmond, VA	<b>-60.9%</b>	-29.0%	-30.5%	<i>program closed</i>	***	<b>-106.0%</b>	<b>-66.9%</b>
6	658 Salem, VA	-14.9%	<b>-89.9%</b>	28.0%	30.8%	29.6%	19.3%	21.2%
6	659 Salisbury, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***
7	508 Atlanta, GA	-5.5%	<b>-22.6%</b>	<b>-34.4%</b>	-0.1%	-15.6%	-1.9%	-20.0%
7	509 Augusta, GA	-8.9%	-33.4%	-12.4%	-10.7%	-23.0%	-14.2%	-22.6%
7	521 Birmingham, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	50.6%	12.9%	39.3%	0.0%	28.6%
7	534 Charleston, SC	18.2%	33.5%	20.7%	29.4%	-8.1%	13.4%	17.7%
7	544 Columbia, SC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	<b>-49.4%</b>	<b>-34.0%</b>
7	557 Dublin, GA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	32.1%	***	41.8%	29.3%
7	619A4 Tuskegee, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-74.0%</b>	-10.2%	48.0%
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	-11.2%	11.4%	-5.3%	-6.2%	28.7%	0.5%	15.9%

Table 37b cont. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY02 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY03 Alcohol Problems Improved %
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	3.7%	39.8%	35.8%	-42.1%	-35.4%	-23.4%	-14.6%
8	546 Miami, FL	-10.3%	-11.7%	12.6%	30.4%	16.2%	-3.2%	14.3%
8	548 W. Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	-25.9%	-24.8%	-3.2%	-18.0%	-0.4%
8	573 N.FL/S.GA VHS	see below	see below	31.7%	11.9%	3.8%	25.6%	4.5%
8	573A Gainesville, FL	***	57.0%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573B Lake City, FL	***	32.8%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	673 Tampa, FL	-4.4%	14.2%	-2.4%	8.7%	0.4%	-5.9%	27.4%
9	596 Lexington, KY	-18.7%	-23.8%	-68.8%	-32.0%	program closed	program closed	program closed
9	614 Memphis, TN	***	11.3%	20.6%	2.1%	5.3%	13.9%	-15.0%
9	621 Mt. Home, TN	-46.6%	-27.3%	-24.6%	-23.1%	35.6%	27.3%	28.7%
9	622 Murfreesboro, TN	-38.0%	-44.4%	-36.2%	-25.4%	-39.5%	-22.4%	-35.3%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	2.1%	17.1%	-9.9%	-17.6%	0.0%	32.1%	31.1%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	45.3%	23.1%	5.2%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	34.3%	16.2%	0.0%	8.2%	12.4%	-6.8%	19.7%
10	552 Dayton, OH	-10.6%	***	-21.7%	0.0%	-41.3%	-0.9%	4.2%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	n.a.	***	***	***	***	-45.8%	-64.4%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	-12.5%	9.2%	-6.5%	-14.2%	-1.2%	-26.7%	-13.9%
11	550 Danville, IL	0.9%	***	-4.0%	-30.1%	-41.3%	-42.4%	-16.1%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	n.a.	-28.5%	-46.7%	-42.6%	-33.6%	-31.3%	-22.4%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	12.4%	***	13.4%	25.6%	27.8%	21.5%	20.3%
12	578 Hines, IL	9.1%	-32.9%	-11.6%	-29.2%	-21.2%	-31.5%	-19.9%
12	585 Iron Mountain, MI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	program closed
12	607 Madison, WI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	31.6%
12	676 Tomah, WI	-46.7%	16.4%	5.1%	-49.2%	22.2%	32.6%	8.4%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	-18.6%	11.7%	42.9%	9.4%	19.3%	5.8%	-14.5%
15	543 Columbia, MO	***	***	-49.9%	***	***	***	***
15	589 Kansas City, KS	-34.6%	9.7%	-2.0%	21.7%	***	***	-8.1%
15	647 Poplar Bluff, MO	***	52.7%	***	***	***	***	***
15	657 St. Louis, MO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***
15	677 Topeka, KS	see below	see below	see below	see below	-56.4%	-71.4%	-52.4%
15	677A4 Leavenworth, KS	-36.9%	-2.8%	-27.2%	-10.8%	-17.6%	-21.5%	6.7%
16	520 Biloxi, MI	-50.4%	32.4%	17.8%	0.6%	17.1%	8.7%	-10.2%
16	580 Houston, TX	-27.6%	44.4%	26.7%	40.5%	23.1%	-7.7%	-38.3%
16	586 Jackson, MS	***	16.3%	-16.0%	-39.7%	-56.8%	-85.9%	-53.7%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	-72.8%	-4.0%	-16.8%	-2.8%	1.5%	4.6%	-14.0%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	-12.6%	-2.1%	***	14.7%	-4.5%	24.6%	35.6%
17	549 Dallas, TX	-8.4%	14.0%	7.1%	-1.2%	-3.5%	-13.8%	-25.7%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	***	-3.1%	1.7%	18.7%	27.9%	18.7%	26.6%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-6.0%	-15.3%	-9.7%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	8.0%	4.4%	-14.6%	-11.9%	-19.6%	-38.1%	-5.3%
17	674 Temple, TX	31.2%	13.8%	-23.8%	-28.5%	11.5%	-11.4%	-13.8%
17	674A4 Waco, TX	25.6%	-2.5%	***	***	-27.8%	***	program closed

**Table 37b cont. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

			FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
			Alcohol Problems Improved	Alcohol Problems Improved	Alcohol Problems Improved	Alcohol Problems Improved	Alcohol Problems Improved	Alcohol Problems Improved	Alcohol Problems Improved
VISN		SITE	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-29.6%	-2.4%	<b>-37.8%</b>
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	<i>n.a.</i>	***	<b>-44.0%</b>	-10.4%	<b>-40.7%</b>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
18	649	Prescott, AZ	55.4%	41.7%	40.1%	18.9%	4.0%	24.5%	10.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	5.4%	<b>-26.2%</b>	3.3%	0.8%	<b>-37.5%</b>	<b>-58.1%</b>	<b>-27.6%</b>
18	756	El Paso	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-28.5%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	36.7%	-3.2%	***	30.2%	<b>-62.2%</b>	14.2%	<b>-45.7%</b>
19	666	Sheridan, WY	<i>n.a.</i>	-12.0%	<b>-57.0%</b>	-18.1%	***	***	<b>-90.5%</b>
20	463	Anchorage, AK	<b>-45.7%</b>	-14.3%	-9.8%	25.7%	4.9%	<b>24.0%</b>	2.1%
20	648	Portland, OR	3.3%	-2.3%	23.1%	44.7%	29.2%	5.0%	7.0%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	<b>-38.8%</b>	-42.2%	-19.1%	-26.1%	<b>-64.2%</b>	***	-37.9%
20	663	Seattle, WA	-39.0%	-32.8%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	6.4%	-16.4%	4.4%	-4.3%	-31.2%	-6.0%	<b>-25.5%</b>
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	15.3%	<b>-67.8%</b>
20	692	White City, OR	<b>-37.4%</b>	5.9%	-11.1%	10.1%	18.7%	0.2%	18.9%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	14.5%	-21.9%	3.8%	-8.7%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	-15.3%	1.6%	-8.0%	-2.9%	-17.6%	-13.1%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	-19.5%	***	<b>-83.6%</b>
21	662	San Francisco, CA	<b>-25.1%</b>	-19.9%	<b>-21.2%</b>	-19.9%	<b>-35.0%</b>	<b>-51.5%</b>	<b>-24.9%</b>
22	600	Long Beach, CA	<b>-39.5%</b>	40.9%	19.1%	-7.1%	18.9%	0.6%	1.2%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	49.8%	46.5%	28.7%	22.3%	20.5%	18.8%	30.1%
22	664	San Diego, CA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	27.1%	6.0%	47.5%	5.6%	0.4%
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	-22.7%	-9.7%	***	***	4.3%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	9.5%	***
23	437	Fargo, ND						<i>n.a.</i>	***
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-4.2%	11.0%	***
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	3.9%	<b>-47.3%</b>	54.4%	54.8%	48.3%	20.7%	-6.6%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	27.9%	25.1%	2.4%	-3.8%	12.8%	-1.0%	0.0%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	50.4%	48.0%	***	7.1%
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	2.7%	45.1%	***	29.6%	<i>program closed</i>
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	-1.4%	<b>-38.1%</b>	9.6%	25.9%	32.9%	-19.7%	47.4%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	3.8%	6.9%	16.1%	2.2%	-18.2%	-5.5%	7.9%

† Improvement in alcohol problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

\*\*\* Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37c. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

			FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
			Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved
VISN	SITE		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	405	White River Jct., VT	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	***	***	-21.8%
1	518	Bedford, MA	-26.4%	-28.1%	-20.1%	-29.6%	-26.0%	-46.3%	-43.1%
1	523	Boston, MA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-64.8%	-3.9%	-36.6%	-33.3%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	40.4%	24.7%	-12.8%	4.2%	-9.8%	-1.3%	11.8%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-20.6%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
1	631	Northampton, MA	2.1%	15.0%	10.6%	14.9%	38.3%	26.5%	21.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	30.9%	0.1%	9.4%	28.7%	34.9%	-35.6%	-23.8%
1	689	West Haven, CT	-18.6%	-20.5%	26.0%	-9.9%	23.5%	-46.8%	-42.5%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-26.9%	-42.4%	-61.1%	-24.8%	-7.9%	-37.5%	3.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	30.2%	-31.1%	-3.6%	7.1%	-21.0%	-13.8%	10.8%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	47.3%	62.1%	52.5%	35.8%	36.5%	39.8%	3.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-21.4%	10.3%	-27.6%	11.3%	-43.4%	-52.2%	-11.5%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	-19.9%	2.3%	-12.6%	-11.9%	0.0%	-31.4%	-36.9%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-54.2%	25.5%	-2.7%	-13.9%	5.4%	-20.9%	-29.4%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	26.1%	15.0%	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-22.4%	43.4%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	11.4%	19.0%	-6.4%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	15.7%	54.1%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	10.2%	39.1%	31.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-15.8%	0.1%	-4.5%	-11.5%	-30.2%	-37.3%	-38.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	<i>n.a.</i>	-6.5%	-1.1%	-8.3%	-27.0%	-51.2%	-16.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	-0.2%	29.7%	12.5%	***	-10.1%	-13.1%	16.4%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	49.3%	42.1%	46.2%	17.9%	44.2%	35.8%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	35.4%	47.1%	41.3%	37.0%	39.6%	34.3%	37.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	16.0%	21.2%	20.8%	27.3%	31.5%	3.0%	14.4%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	63.7%	59.8%	36.7%	-0.2%	47.0%	<i>program closed</i>
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-34.7%	5.6%	17.6%	0.0%	22.6%	-3.9%	15.6%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	11.0%	3.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-4.2%	48.1%	18.7%	-16.5%	8.7%	3.6%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	<i>n.a.</i>	***	20.6%	-5.4%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	10.3%	-17.1%	45.9%	***	43.0%	39.8%	32.9%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	<i>n.a.</i>	***	7.5%	6.2%	19.1%	32.2%	4.3%
5	688	Washington DC	-44.4%	-9.2%	-20.1%	-50.5%	-20.6%	-33.0%	-12.1%
6	558	Durham, NC	50.1%	2.4%	19.5%	***	19.8%	***	<i>program closed</i>
6	590	Hampton, VA	0.0%	-17.5%	7.5%	-6.0%	33.2%	18.8%	19.7%
6	637	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	***	-12.5%	-19.5%	38.8%
6	652	Richmond, VA	-64.3%	-23.1%	-23.1%	<i>program closed</i>	***	-24.6%	-98.6%
6	658	Salem, VA	-13.5%	-102.9%	14.6%	27.1%	26.1%	25.9%	35.9%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-5.4%	-28.8%	-38.0%	-0.2%	-7.9%	0.0%	-19.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-22.9%	-30.0%	-17.9%	-12.8%	-13.4%	-15.0%	-37.1%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	36.5%	19.6%	33.6%	10.2%	28.6%
7	534	Charleston, SC	40.1%	8.8%	-17.1%	32.1%	-37.6%	-3.9%	5.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-32.6%	-40.5%
7	557	Dublin, GA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	36.3%	***	43.7%	26.8%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-90.4%	-19.6%	48.5%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	-10.9%	8.7%	-11.4%	-2.1%	-33.5%	-9.7%	3.5%

Table 37c cont. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %	FY02 Drug Problems Improved %	FY03 Drug Problems Improved %
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	31.9%	48.1%	39.0%	-26.0%	-12.8%	-36.3%	-12.8%
8	546 Miami, FL	-22.4%	-21.4%	-14.8%	-2.9%	3.5%	7.6%	10.5%
8	548 W. Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	-28.3%	***	3.6%	-22.0%	0.0%
8	573 N.FL/S.GA VHS	see below	see below	16.3%	1.0%	5.8%	16.1%	-2.4%
8	573A Gainesville, FL	***	49.7%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573B Lake City, FL	***	5.9%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	673 Tampa, FL	-3.3%	29.2%	-39.3%	10.2%	-7.6%	-7.9%	18.7%
9	596 Lexington, KY	-8.4%	-26.0%	-47.5%	-41.5%	program closed	program closed	program closed
9	614 Memphis, TN	***	11.4%	20.3%	10.0%	2.9%	23.5%	-26.8%
9	621 Mt. Home, TN	-24.3%	-20.7%	-45.4%	-55.6%	39.7%	26.4%	26.9%
9	622 Murfreesboro, TN	-32.1%	-44.2%	-32.1%	-23.9%	-37.8%	-24.2%	-48.4%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	4.1%	16.2%	3.5%	-27.4%	7.3%	32.6%	26.1%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	48.5%	24.3%	-0.3%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	41.4%	17.5%	6.1%	10.2%	15.3%	0.6%	13.2%
10	552 Dayton, OH	-0.5%	***	-33.2%	-2.7%	-31.9%	0.4%	-37.0%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	n.a.	***	***	***	***	-42.6%	-94.8%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	-17.4%	0.2%	-12.8%	-24.6%	-14.3%	-27.1%	-26.8%
11	550 Danville, IL	10.0%	***	-14.6%	-34.0%	-31.9%	-31.1%	-6.9%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	n.a.	17.8%	-37.5%	-56.7%	-69.6%	-21.1%	-23.1%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	8.9%	***	10.7%	27.6%	28.7%	24.2%	16.1%
12	578 Hines, IL	12.4%	-33.0%	-18.2%	-26.6%	-19.8%	-19.2%	-44.2%
12	585 Iron Mountain, MI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	program closed
12	607 Madison, WI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	40.7%
12	676 Tomah, WI	-24.1%	12.2%	12.2%	-42.2%	18.1%	7.4%	-20.3%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	-6.7%	8.7%	41.0%	1.7%	6.0%	-21.3%	-10.8%
15	543 Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	589 Kansas City, KS	-32.2%	9.3%	4.7%	11.8%	***	***	-9.1%
15	647 Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-41.1%	***	***	***	***	***
15	657 St. Louis, MO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***
15	677 Topeka, KS	see below	see below	see below	see below	-37.2%	-67.1%	-52.4%
15	677A4 Leavenworth, KS	-47.6%	-33.1%	-23.2%	-9.0%	-21.5%	-21.1%	3.0%
16	520 Biloxi, MI	-38.0%	30.3%	14.1%	20.3%	29.4%	5.7%	2.7%
16	580 Houston, TX	-24.3%	51.8%	31.2%	40.9%	33.8%	-13.9%	-37.0%
16	586 Jackson, MS	***	-47.2%	-32.0%	-34.5%	-73.5%	-86.1%	-72.7%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	-68.2%	-0.2%	-11.8%	-7.8%	8.1%	11.8%	-16.5%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	34.6%	-10.3%	***	-9.6%	-7.9%	-1.7%	7.0%
17	549 Dallas, TX	-15.5%	0.0%	-5.5%	-12.3%	-13.4%	-22.5%	-39.6%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	n.a.	43.0%	18.7%	19.9%	25.5%	3.5%	4.9%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2.4%	-13.8%	-8.7%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	-19.0%	-38.7%	***	7.8%	-8.4%	-22.5%	-27.5%
17	674 Temple, TX	20.3%	-6.0%	1.7%	-8.8%	-9.8%	-2.6%	-13.4%
17	674A4 Waco, TX	41.2%	-20.8%	***	***	-10.3%	***	program closed

**Table 37c cont. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

VISN	SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %	FY02 Drug Problems Improved %	FY03 Drug Problems Improved %
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-36.9%	18.3%	<b>-32.6%</b>
18	644 Phoenix, AZ	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	<b>-33.5%</b>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
18	649 Prescott, AZ	38.2%	53.6%	52.9%	31.5%	45.6%	44.8%	25.0%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	13.3%	-43.5%	0.5%	-3.8%	<b>-41.2%</b>	<b>-52.5%</b>	<b>-33.1%</b>
18	756 El Paso	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE Col. Springs, CO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-29.7%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	13.8%	61.1%	***	***	-28.4%	-41.4%	-26.1%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	<i>n.a.</i>	-14.3%	-29.8%	***	***	***	<b>-49.4%</b>
20	463 Anchorage, AK	-25.7%	-13.1%	-1.7%	19.9%	16.0%	8.6%	23.2%
20	648 Portland, OR	-11.3%	26.3%	37.0%	35.5%	39.3%	23.7%	20.2%
20	653 Roseburg, OR	-21.5%	-25.0%	-17.7%	-18.6%	<b>-38.9%</b>	***	-3.8%
20	663 Seattle, WA	-10.9%	-54.3%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
20	663A4 Am. Lake, WA	26.9%	-12.8%	6.7%	-14.7%	<b>-36.7%</b>	<b>-41.3%</b>	<b>-34.1%</b>
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-30.7%	<b>-53.2%</b>
20	692 White City, OR	-21.4%	11.5%	0.0%	13.3%	18.7%	28.0%	17.3%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	37.1%	22.0%	24.8%	-53.8%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	***	-26.1%	19.7%	0.5%	-1.4%	-20.3%	<b>-27.1%</b>
21	654 Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	-37.3%	***	<b>-66.6%</b>
21	662 San Francisco, CA	-20.5%	-16.3%	<b>-24.9%</b>	<b>-29.2%</b>	<b>-35.9%</b>	<b>-45.3%</b>	-17.1%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	-33.0%	28.7%	19.3%	-2.4%	36.0%	-1.0%	-7.1%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	54.5%	45.7%	30.8%	18.3%	18.3%	23.0%	26.9%
22	664 San Diego, CA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	26.8%	61.7%	34.1%	-14.9%
22	691 West LA, CA	***	***	-26.6%	-4.1%	***	-2.8%	3.4%
22	691A4 Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437 Fargo, ND	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***
23	438 Sioux Falls, SD	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-39.9%	22.5%	***
23	568 Fort Meade, SD	-7.0%	<b>-32.7%</b>	33.0%	41.9%	29.3%	13.2%	3.2%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	53.6%	28.4%	***	28.5%	39.0%	35.4%	17.4%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	51.8%	18.9%	-3.1%
23	636A6 Des Moines, IA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-7.6%	37.1%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	-0.8%	<b>-36.5%</b>	-1.7%	21.0%	55.5%	42.9%	45.7%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	2.6%	9.8%	2.4%	-0.8%	-12.0%	<b>-24.8%</b>	-0.1%

† Improvement in drug problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

\*\*\* Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

**Table 37d. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

			FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
			Mental Health Problems Improved	Mental Health Problems Improved	Mental Health Problems Improved	Mental Health Problems Improved	Mental Health Problems Improved	Mental Health Problems Improved	Mental Health Problems Improved
VISN	SITE		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	405	White River Jct., VT	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	***	***	37.9%
1	518	Bedford, MA	<b>-20.3%</b>	-19.3%	<b>-33.4%</b>	<b>-36.3%</b>	<b>-41.4%</b>	<b>-55.8%</b>	<b>-43.6%</b>
1	523	Boston, MA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-86.8%</b>	<b>-42.4%</b>	<b>-49.3%</b>	<b>-64.8%</b>
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	15.1%	14.8%	-17.3%	1.7%	-15.4%	-12.6%	7.7%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-23.1%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
1	631	Northampton, MA	-3.7%	4.3%	-8.5%	<b>-26.8%</b>	2.0%	9.5%	10.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	-19.4%	<b>-22.8%</b>	-7.4%	24.0%	21.3%	<b>-37.1%</b>	-28.8%
1	689	West Haven, CT	-13.0%	-9.1%	9.0%	-15.3%	-0.5%	<b>-37.2%</b>	<b>-32.1%</b>
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-21.7%	-14.2%	<b>-47.6%</b>	<b>-45.9%</b>	<b>-41.7%</b>	<b>-39.8%</b>	-25.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	-2.1%	3.8%	14.3%	***	13.4%	7.5%	17.7%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	43.9%	79.0%	55.9%	40.3%	34.6%	46.9%	20.2%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-11.5%	11.8%	<b>-38.8%</b>	-16.9%	<b>-61.4%</b>	<b>-52.0%</b>	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	<b>-48.4%</b>	1.0%	-3.4%	-13.0%	<b>-33.3%</b>	<b>-37.2%</b>	<b>-36.1%</b>
3	526	Bronx, NY	-42.2%	47.9%	16.9%	<b>-46.1%</b>	22.1%	<b>-37.6%</b>	-9.4%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	-2.7%	<b>-33.6%</b>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-19.4%	65.7%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	4.7%	10.1%	-11.8%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	20.7%	61.1%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	12.4%	41.9%	44.4%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-9.5%	-0.9%	<b>-18.3%</b>	-11.3%	<b>-52.8%</b>	<b>-48.4%</b>	<b>-42.0%</b>
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	<i>n.a.</i>	0.0%	0.0%	-12.8%	<b>-32.8%</b>	<b>-36.6%</b>	-18.3%
3	632	Northport, NY	-9.9%	-1.3%	-21.6%	***	-19.4%	-8.7%	-5.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	48.1%	60.5%	34.5%	37.9%	37.4%	26.7%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	16.7%	47.9%	36.5%	14.5%	19.2%	19.4%	17.8%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	2.2%	10.0%	11.4%	<b>-35.1%</b>	8.8%	15.7%	0.7%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	71.5%	62.1%	33.2%	26.5%	51.4%	<i>program closed</i>
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	<b>-30.5%</b>	-10.5%	-13.5%	-11.3%	26.6%	16.2%	36.2%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-11.9%	12.6%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	0.3%	14.8%	-20.3%	26.9%	-6.6%	-15.2%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	-10.3%	-38.2%	33.4%	***	0.8%	18.7%	15.8%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-10.2%	-0.7%	6.0%	34.7%	5.5%
5	688	Washington DC	<b>-33.7%</b>	-23.7%	-29.0%	<b>-46.8%</b>	-16.0%	-11.9%	-24.5%
6	558	Durham, NC	32.2%	32.5%	***	***	49.1%	***	<i>program closed</i>
6	590	Hampton, VA	-7.4%	-17.9%	22.3%	<b>-21.0%</b>	0.0%	9.9%	16.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	<b>-48.1%</b>	32.3%	40.6%
6	652	Richmond, VA	<b>-60.3%</b>	<b>-57.1%</b>	-5.7%	<i>program closed</i>	***	<b>-111.1%</b>	<b>-48.8%</b>
6	658	Salem, VA	-28.6%	-35.8%	21.0%	17.0%	42.6%	19.2%	50.1%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	4.4%	-6.2%	-18.7%	15.7%	-11.4%	9.4%	-8.8%
7	509	Augusta, GA	10.8%	-20.2%	-7.1%	-5.2%	-5.4%	-14.4%	-19.5%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	40.6%	50.5%	-28.9%	33.1%
7	534	Charleston, SC	-0.7%	36.0%	7.6%	1.3%	-14.8%	<b>-32.6%</b>	22.2%
7	544	Columbia, SC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-27.7%	<b>-46.0%</b>
7	557	Dublin, GA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	33.8%	29.1%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-56.6%</b>	-9.1%	52.9%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	4.9%	7.6%	-7.6%	-10.8%	18.8%	1.2%	14.3%

**Table 37d cont. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

VISN	SITE	FY96 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY98 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY99 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY00 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY01 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY02 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY03 Mental Health Problems Improved %
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	12.3%	63.5%	49.6%	<b>-27.8%</b>	<b>-41.2%</b>	-28.1%	7.0%
8	546 Miami, FL	14.8%	-0.3%	-2.5%	0.0%	-7.5%	-12.2%	-7.3%
8	548 W. Palm Beach, FL	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-31.9%	-31.6%	-21.0%	-20.5%	-13.6%
8	573 N.FL/S.GA VHS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	16.4%	16.4%	-3.7%	12.1%	-22.5%
8	573A Gainesville, FL	***	34.0%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>
8	573B Lake City, FL	***	-9.7%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>
8	673 Tampa, FL	-20.7%	21.1%	-27.1%	-4.2%	-22.2%	-17.3%	5.5%
9	596 Lexington, KY	-17.7%	<b>-33.0%</b>	<b>-34.8%</b>	<b>-48.6%</b>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
9	614 Memphis, TN	***	8.9%	***	-0.2%	-9.7%	20.8%	-19.2%
9	621 Mt. Home, TN	<b>-21.6%</b>	-7.4%	<b>-36.4%</b>	<b>-45.7%</b>	26.0%	24.5%	33.0%
9	622 Murfreesboro, TN	<b>-30.4%</b>	<b>-31.3%</b>	<b>-39.3%</b>	<b>-52.9%</b>	<b>-52.4%</b>	<b>-38.2%</b>	<b>-49.9%</b>
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	0.0%	5.7%	-15.2%	<b>-26.7%</b>	-22.6%	27.5%	36.6%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	45.2%	25.8%	17.2%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	-10.7%	12.2%	-19.2%	21.9%	31.1%	9.5%	32.8%
10	552 Dayton, OH	<b>-40.5%</b>	***	0.3%	***	-19.6%	-11.4%	-13.6%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	-40.7%	<b>-33.3%</b>
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	-8.1%	7.7%	<b>-23.7%</b>	<b>-23.6%</b>	-24.5%	<b>-46.8%</b>	<b>-45.4%</b>
11	550 Danville, IL	24.9%	***	11.3%	-12.5%	-19.6%	-21.2%	-12.0%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	<i>n.a.</i>	31.2%	<b>-44.3%</b>	<b>-42.4%</b>	-21.4%	-14.1%	-30.6%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	11.6%	***	-5.8%	11.3%	7.1%	3.9%	12.5%
12	578 Hines, IL	-19.4%	<b>-48.3%</b>	<b>-30.4%</b>	<b>-28.8%</b>	<b>-28.7%</b>	<b>-51.3%</b>	<b>-55.6%</b>
12	585 Iron Mountain, MI	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
12	607 Madison, WI	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	12.1%
12	676 Tomah, WI	<b>-34.8%</b>	-18.1%	7.9%	<b>-52.4%</b>	12.5%	14.5%	15.3%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	-25.3%	4.8%	28.1%	15.7%	9.7%	13.6%	8.4%
15	543 Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	589 Kansas City, KS	<b>-21.5%</b>	21.7%	6.6%	23.8%	***	***	8.0%
15	647 Poplar Bluff, MO	***	55.4%	***	***	***	***	***
15	657 St. Louis, MO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***
15	677 Topeka, KS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<b>-45.7%</b>	<b>-54.5%</b>	<b>-61.6%</b>
15	677A4 Leavenworth, KS	<b>-39.9%</b>	-12.1%	-7.1%	-12.5%	-18.0%	-11.4%	21.6%
16	520 Biloxi, MI	<b>-28.6%</b>	33.0%	23.3%	-16.1%	8.7%	4.0%	-8.1%
16	580 Houston, TX	<b>-21.4%</b>	53.1%	34.6%	40.0%	22.9%	-12.0%	-21.8%
16	586 Jackson, MS	***	-15.5%	***	-10.0%	<b>-113.5%</b>	-26.5%	<b>-40.0%</b>
16	598 Little Rock, AR	<b>-57.1%</b>	-2.3%	<b>-23.9%</b>	<b>-33.4%</b>	<b>-25.6%</b>	<b>-34.6%</b>	<b>-37.5%</b>
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	<b>-65.4%</b>	12.6%	***	<b>-75.5%</b>	<b>-60.5%</b>	<b>-69.1%</b>	-22.8%
17	549 Dallas, TX	<b>-17.1%</b>	6.6%	-10.1%	-12.9%	-14.3%	-22.4%	<b>-40.0%</b>
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	<i>n.a.</i>	34.3%	29.9%	24.3%	27.9%	3.6%	9.2%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-0.5%	-5.4%	3.6%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	-8.3%	-14.2%	7.6%	***	-39.3%	-18.5%	<b>-37.9%</b>
17	674 Temple, TX	8.1%	-1.0%	-5.5%	***	-2.4%	-22.1%	6.2%
17	674A4 Waco, TX	30.0%	-7.9%	***	***	26.3%	***	<i>program closed</i>

Table 37d cont. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY98 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY99 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY00 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY01 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY02 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY03 Mental Health Problems Improved %
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	<b>-86.1%</b>	2.6%	<b>-36.5%</b>
18	644 Phoenix, AZ	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-32.0%	-22.8%	-22.3%	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
18	649 Prescott, AZ	29.9%	19.3%	35.3%	7.6%	16.1%	0.0%	9.0%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	-22.8%	<b>-36.3%</b>	-10.9%	-3.7%	<b>-64.4%</b>	-28.1%	<b>-32.0%</b>
18	756 El Paso	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE Col. Springs, CO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-4.8%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	24.8%	44.9%	2.4%	41.5%	-19.3%	10.2%	-2.9%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	<i>n.a.</i>	-8.6%	<b>-48.2%</b>	***	***	***	-23.2%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	<b>-47.9%</b>	-3.2%	-16.0%	10.0%	22.0%	-0.7%	12.5%
20	648 Portland, OR	<b>-29.1%</b>	<b>-79.9%</b>	50.8%	38.7%	38.3%	23.4%	39.5%
20	653 Roseburg, OR	-0.6%	<b>-54.6%</b>	-28.5%	2.7%	-27.3%	***	11.8%
20	663 Seattle, WA	<b>-41.1%</b>	-10.3%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
20	663A4 Am. Lake, WA	13.8%	<b>-24.1%</b>	2.9%	0.0%	-14.0%	-20.7%	-28.6%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-28.0%	-16.4%
20	692 White City, OR	-18.7%	17.3%	-13.0%	1.9%	17.8%	7.9%	6.3%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	28.2%	-26.6%	0.0%	-28.5%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	***	<b>-26.7%</b>	-25.8%	-26.4%	-1.3%	-25.4%	-27.4%
21	654 Reno, NV	***	***	***	5.3%	<b>-49.4%</b>	***	<b>-58.2%</b>
21	662 San Francisco, CA	-19.0%	-16.8%	<b>-34.5%</b>	<b>-53.0%</b>	<b>-54.8%</b>	<b>-47.4%</b>	-23.1%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	18.4%	54.9%	32.1%	-5.0%	31.2%	9.0%	15.3%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	37.8%	52.7%	16.3%	21.3%	-1.5%	10.3%	35.5%
22	664 San Diego, CA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	<b>-46.3%</b>	-12.7%	1.1%	4.1%	-10.0%
22	691 West LA, CA	***	***	-22.8%	-20.0%	***	-9.1%	11.1%
22	691A4 Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437 Fargo, ND	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***
23	438 Sioux Falls, SD	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-59.8%</b>	11.8%	***
23	568 Fort Meade, SD	-1.6%	<b>-41.1%</b>	53.0%	50.6%	54.0%	29.0%	26.5%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	35.8%	60.2%	0.6%	26.2%	20.7%	12.2%	44.4%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	44.4%	14.1%	26.6%	10.9%
23	636A6 Des Moines, IA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	7.6%	16.5%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	5.2%	<b>-19.8%</b>	6.6%	36.7%	55.9%	38.5%	52.0%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	6.9%	23.8%	-0.5%	-13.4%	-20.5%	-19.9%	-2.7%

† Improvement in mental health problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

\*\*\* Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10)

**Table 37e. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

VISN		SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %	FY02 Medical Problems Improved %	FY03 Medical Problems Improved %
1	405	White River Jct., VT	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	***	***	59.7%
1	518	Bedford, MA	-8.8%	-1.7%	-7.9%	<b>-11.5%</b>	<b>-17.6%</b>	<b>-22.2%</b>	<b>-19.1%</b>
1	523	Boston, MA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-20.7%	-0.8%	14.7%	-16.9%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	26.2%	24.2%	-5.8%	12.0%	3.8%	16.0%	11.4%
1	608	Manchester, NH	<b>-33.8%</b>	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
1	631	Northampton, MA	1.6%	18.9%	0.0%	-11.5%	0.0%	14.1%	16.6%
1	650	Providence, RI	2.2%	13.2%	0.0%	20.3%	50.1%	<b>-21.4%</b>	-12.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	-18.6%	-3.9%	20.3%	0.9%	14.9%	<b>-35.2%</b>	<b>-26.3%</b>
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-19.3%	-12.2%	<b>-27.1%</b>	<b>-35.7%</b>	-16.2%	<b>-30.3%</b>	<b>-27.9%</b>
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	17.7%	13.4%	15.3%	***	40.1%	-4.8%	16.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	26.4%	-104.6%	76.2%	63.2%	58.0%	71.9%	39.6%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	<b>-27.8%</b>	19.6%	-9.0%	0.2%	<b>-53.2%</b>	<b>-34.6%</b>	-3.4%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	<b>-26.9%</b>	1.6%	-11.1%	-12.1%	-14.3%	-9.7%	<b>-19.7%</b>
3	526	Bronx, NY	-7.9%	96.7%	***	<b>-54.8%</b>	<b>-40.1%</b>	<b>-33.1%</b>	<b>-56.3%</b>
3	561	New Jersey HCS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	10.9%	-1.1%	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	1.9%	75.3%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	-10.0%	9.2%	12.9%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	-9.5%	80.6%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	59.3%	70.0%	66.7%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-12.1%	4.3%	-12.0%	1.6%	-16.6%	<b>-20.5%</b>	<b>-34.0%</b>
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	<i>n.a.</i>	-4.2%	-1.9%	15.9%	-18.2%	-10.4%	2.8%
3	632	Northport, NY	-23.2%	26.7%	5.8%	***	5.2%	15.0%	9.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	29.3%	***	21.5%	-1.5%	-6.5%	8.4%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	-5.2%	42.5%	50.5%	9.7%	26.8%	25.9%	34.5%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	<b>-30.3%</b>	3.3%	-13.5%	-24.6%	-18.6%	9.3%	-6.1%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	87.6%	79.5%	65.9%	80.0%	80.9%	<i>program closed</i>
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	<b>-28.4%</b>	-8.8%	<b>-27.3%</b>	<b>-22.9%</b>	31.7%	19.8%	-5.2%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-7.2%	27.3%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-2.5%	18.0%	***	<b>-46.7%</b>	<b>-21.3%</b>	-8.4%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	18.6%	-10.4%	-14.9%	***	-18.5%	-0.5%	<b>-25.6%</b>
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-5.7%	27.7%	17.1%	48.0%	36.9%
5	688	Washington DC	<b>-23.0%</b>	1.0%	-21.4%	<b>-32.1%</b>	17.8%	16.7%	19.0%
6	558	Durham, NC	-5.3%	15.2%	16.5%	***	65.2%	***	<i>program closed</i>
6	590	Hampton, VA	-3.7%	-4.2%	-6.9%	<b>-21.2%</b>	<b>-21.7%</b>	<b>-22.1%</b>	-15.4%
6	637	Asheville, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-33.2%	43.2%	60.2%
6	652	Richmond, VA	<b>-26.1%</b>	-18.7%	-11.9%	<i>program closed</i>	***	<b>-67.0%</b>	<b>-37.6%</b>
6	658	Salem, VA	-24.9%	-16.6%	42.2%	69.5%	75.3%	54.4%	32.8%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	4.2%	0.0%	11.8%	10.9%	-7.3%	9.9%	20.1%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-7.0%	-11.3%	4.1%	-24.9%	9.9%	<b>-35.4%</b>	<b>-27.0%</b>
7	521	Birmingham, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	70.2%	60.9%	72.6%	42.4%	65.6%
7	534	Charleston, SC	-5.9%	18.3%	2.0%	6.5%	-1.3%	-11.5%	37.5%
7	544	Columbia, SC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	1.6%	11.4%
7	557	Dublin, GA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	73.6%	66.9%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-46.4%	8.3%	75.8%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	9.6%	28.9%	-9.4%	18.1%	0.2%	-9.6%	-0.5%

Table 37e cont. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %	FY02 Medical Problems Improved %	FY03 Medical Problems Improved %
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	-19.5%	74.0%	67.4%	-21.0%	0.7%	2.6%	18.5%
8	546 Miami, FL	-15.8%	6.7%	12.5%	-0.5%	-28.7%	-20.7%	-29.4%
8	548 W. Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	***	-46.6%	-47.6%	-30.8%	-35.4%
8	573 N.FL/S.GA VHS	see below	see below	-2.1%	12.0%	9.2%	-2.0%	-26.9%
8	573A Gainesville, FL	***	11.7%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573B Lake City, FL	***	-4.6%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	673 Tampa, FL	-0.6%	26.4%	2.7%	-11.1%	6.7%	-12.1%	-15.0%
9	596 Lexington, KY	-16.1%	-16.7%	-33.7%	-24.5%	program closed	program closed	program closed
9	614 Memphis, TN	***	30.0%	30.1%	26.5%	-2.3%	31.3%	-9.1%
9	621 Mt. Home, TN	-9.2%	1.4%	-21.4%	-33.3%	32.2%	66.6%	53.9%
9	622 Murfreesboro, TN	-11.6%	-11.7%	-19.4%	-29.0%	-31.1%	-21.2%	-34.4%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	4.9%	3.2%	-16.3%	-16.3%	-7.9%	33.9%	3.2%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	70.3%	55.7%	37.9%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	6.7%	3.3%	-18.8%	***	21.3%	14.5%	-1.6%
10	552 Dayton, OH	3.9%	***	-5.1%	***	-29.5%	15.7%	15.5%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	n.a.	***	***	***	***	-22.9%	-27.3%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	5.2%	13.5%	-0.7%	-12.2%	-3.7%	-13.2%	-22.8%
11	550 Danville, IL	-11.0%	***	20.8%	-1.2%	-29.5%	14.5%	33.6%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	n.a.	13.3%	-22.9%	-19.2%	-50.5%	-22.3%	-21.8%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	15.0%	***	30.9%	18.2%	7.0%	3.4%	-15.5%
12	578 Hines, IL	6.0%	-25.6%	-18.8%	-23.2%	-15.3%	-39.0%	-30.9%
12	585 Iron Mountain, MI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	program closed
12	607 Madison, WI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-24.0%
12	676 Tomah, WI	0.0%	30.7%	38.4%	-19.9%	46.8%	42.1%	35.0%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	-19.3%	30.1%	26.8%	21.2%	23.2%	7.4%	-3.9%
15	543 Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	589 Kansas City, KS	-8.3%	59.2%	33.1%	42.6%	***	***	18.1%
15	647 Poplar Bluff, MO	***	68.3%	***	***	***	***	***
15	657 St. Louis, MO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***
15	677 Topeka, KS	see below	see below	see below	see below	3.1%	-39.0%	-21.0%
15	677A4 Leavenworth, KS	2.1%	17.2%	30.4%	24.0%	12.9%	29.1%	47.0%
16	520 Biloxi, MI	-16.6%	4.5%	27.1%	11.3%	20.8%	8.3%	0.5%
16	580 Houston, TX	-22.3%	50.4%	33.7%	36.6%	46.5%	-8.7%	-16.6%
16	586 Jackson, MS	***	27.7%	-18.8%	-5.9%	-31.8%	-10.1%	-30.5%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	-15.2%	6.3%	-13.5%	-12.9%	-12.1%	-11.8%	-23.8%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	47.9%	-28.0%	***	-64.6%	-39.0%	-25.0%	-12.8%
17	549 Dallas, TX	-0.1%	10.6%	-5.6%	-4.5%	4.3%	0.0%	-15.4%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	n.a.	45.8%	41.9%	57.8%	46.4%	41.5%	62.7%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	21.9%	24.3%	27.5%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	-13.9%	33.7%	29.0%	-8.4%	-91.5%	-11.3%	-26.1%
17	674 Temple, TX	15.6%	2.5%	***	***	-2.8%	7.3%	25.4%
17	674A4 Waco, TX	12.5%	3.8%	***	***	7.6%	***	program closed

**Table 37e cont. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

VISN	SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %	FY02 Medical Problems Improved %	FY03 Medical Problems Improved %
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-22.3%	20.8%	3.8%
18	644 Phoenix, AZ	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	-2.9%	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
18	649 Prescott, AZ	29.7%	60.6%	51.5%	62.6%	47.0%	28.3%	43.8%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	<b>-25.7%</b>	-11.0%	-17.1%	17.5%	-11.6%	15.8%	-19.0%
18	756 El Paso	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE Col. Springs, CO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-0.5%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	18.8%	-4.4%	<b>-35.4%</b>	-6.6%	-13.4%	-5.4%	-14.4%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	<i>n.a.</i>	-2.6%	-21.2%	***	***	***	-13.7%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	-13.2%	19.0%	9.1%	18.2%	34.5%	31.9%	29.8%
20	648 Portland, OR	-26.6%	21.9%	54.4%	68.8%	60.1%	60.8%	65.5%
20	653 Roseburg, OR	-18.1%	-36.6%	-2.7%	10.1%	-16.9%	***	-42.5%
20	663 Seattle, WA	-9.1%	-12.2%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
20	663A4 Am. Lake, WA	-2.7%	1.6%	27.4%	25.1%	14.7%	-12.2%	-2.8%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	19.5%	-35.1%
20	692 White City, OR	-5.0%	16.3%	17.4%	32.5%	29.7%	61.1%	49.2%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	***	-32.2%	13.9%	<b>-51.0%</b>
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	***	4.5%	-17.3%	-14.2%	10.4%	0.8%	-3.0%
21	654 Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	6.2%	***	<b>-34.5%</b>
21	662 San Francisco, CA	-10.3%	<b>-20.8%</b>	-16.0%	<b>-23.1%</b>	<b>-42.4%</b>	<b>-27.3%</b>	-5.8%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	-4.7%	34.6%	36.8%	20.6%	45.6%	36.1%	33.0%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	12.1%	39.5%	15.0%	27.7%	27.0%	45.1%	24.1%
22	664 San Diego, CA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-22.7%	2.1%	15.6%	20.2%	-2.7%
22	691 West LA, CA	***	***	6.9%	11.6%	***	29.1%	29.6%
22	691A4 Sepulveda, CA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***
23	437 Fargo, ND	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***
23	438 Sioux Falls, SD	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-21.0%	-15.2%	***
23	568 Fort Meade, SD	12.3%	-1.1%	43.7%	71.3%	81.2%	48.5%	57.7%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	26.6%	37.9%	***	69.2%	32.4%	57.3%	59.8%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-11.2%	-20.0%	27.8%	-3.3%
23	636A6 Des Moines, IA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	2.3%	39.9%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	11.9%	-12.8%	16.1%	45.5%	77.0%	62.1%	57.9%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	9.2%	31.3%	1.2%	0.0%	-4.9%	-4.5%	0.0%

† Improvement in medical problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

\*\*\* Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10)

Table 37f. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

			FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
			Competitively Employed at Discharge	Competitively Employed at Discharge	Competitively Employed at Discharge	Competitively Employed at Discharge	Competitively Employed at Discharge	Competitively Employed at Discharge	Competitively Employed at Discharge
VISN	SITE		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	405	White River Jct., VT	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	***	***	23.2%
1	518	Bedford, MA	<b>-31.9%</b>	<b>-25.8%</b>	<b>-14.0%</b>	<b>-9.6%</b>	<b>-12.5%</b>	<b>-15.3%</b>	<b>-17.0%</b>
1	523	Boston, MA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-7.3%	22.2%	9.1%	5.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	1.3%	-8.8%	-9.7%	-11.7%	<b>-24.5%</b>	<b>-14.0%</b>	2.1%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-8.3%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
1	631	Northampton, MA	-0.2%	<b>-15.2%</b>	-4.3%	6.4%	15.1%	6.0%	4.2%
1	650	Providence, RI	<b>-18.4%</b>	<b>-22.0%</b>	<b>-18.6%</b>	-14.3%	<b>-24.0%</b>	<b>-20.6%</b>	-2.7%
1	689	West Haven, CT	0.0%	-7.7%	25.8%	1.7%	6.7%	3.0%	6.3%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-9.8%	-12.1%	-10.5%	-11.1%	-2.1%	-6.3%	4.7%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	-4.8%	<b>-21.4%</b>	<b>-18.2%</b>	2.5%	9.0%	16.2%	19.6%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	4.8%	<b>-43.5%</b>	-1.4%	11.8%	20.2%	24.0%	-1.4%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	<b>-16.4%</b>	-10.5%	-1.5%	8.0%	-4.4%	<b>-14.0%</b>	6.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	<b>-16.7%</b>	-8.9%	-2.2%	2.6%	13.4%	4.0%	10.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-23.8%	10.0%	-7.6%	-3.7%	0.6%	-1.1%	-0.3%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	14.9%	11.8%	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-4.1%	20.1%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	15.2%	19.4%	-10.3%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	9.8%	<b>20.1%</b>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	12.6%	-2.6%	-0.4%
3	620	Montrose, NY	5.6%	<b>-13.1%</b>	<b>-12.4%</b>	-5.1%	<b>-10.9%</b>	-6.3%	-10.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	<i>n.a.</i>	4.7%	23.3%	2.9%	-5.6%	-2.4%	-11.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	-12.8%	-3.9%	9.6%	***	<b>-17.1%</b>	-2.6%	1.8%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	-3.6%	-10.9%	-1.8%	-4.7%	-1.4%	0.7%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	-5.4%	21.6%	2.2%	<b>-9.3%</b>	10.4%	2.6%	-0.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	1.6%	-2.3%	0.5%	4.7%	9.3%	2.6%	-8.6%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	-6.6%	31.2%	<b>-19.2%</b>	-1.6%	49.5%	<i>program closed</i>
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-0.9%	-10.0%	1.7%	<b>-12.8%</b>	-4.7%	-0.4%	-3.9%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	24.2%	6.6%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-6.0%	-9.0%	10.3%	<b>-34.9%</b>	0.6%	-4.1%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	<i>n.a.</i>	***	21.9%	14.3%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	23.9%	-6.3%	-12.0%	***	<b>-16.9%</b>	<b>-19.3%</b>	<b>-25.8%</b>
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	<i>n.a.</i>	***	21.2%	6.4%	-6.0%	0.0%	<b>-14.8%</b>
5	688	Washington DC	20.3%	-15.2%	8.6%	1.3%	7.4%	6.6%	7.0%
6	558	Durham, NC	29.9%	9.3%	5.2%	-4.0%	-7.7%	***	<i>program closed</i>
6	590	Hampton, VA	20.0%	-10.3%	3.3%	7.1%	15.0%	1.2%	20.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	11.6%	24.1%	20.3%
6	652	Richmond, VA	<b>-24.9%</b>	3.4%	-18.5%	<i>program closed</i>	***	-24.9%	-15.2%
6	658	Salem, VA	<b>-20.9%</b>	-6.0%	-2.8%	-11.5%	-11.2%	<b>-17.8%</b>	-7.9%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-1.7%	-9.7%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	6.8%	10.5%
7	509	Augusta, GA	<b>-23.9%</b>	<b>-24.2%</b>	3.0%	-7.8%	-11.5%	-15.7%	-14.4%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	21.4%	16.0%	21.1%	<b>-16.1%</b>	17.1%
7	534	Charleston, SC	-5.6%	11.1%	2.4%	17.1%	-11.3%	9.5%	22.8%
7	544	Columbia, SC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	4.9%	-3.1%
7	557	Dublin, GA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	9.6%	***	2.2%	<b>-18.3%</b>
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>-35.3%</b>	-6.6%	12.5%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	0.0%	-10.5%	-5.7%	-10.8%	-1.9%	4.3%	6.8%

Table 37f cont. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY02 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY03 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	-1.0%	-7.9%	-4.8%	<b>-9.6%</b>	-7.6%	-7.5%	1.2%
8	546 Miami, FL	14.9%	-18.7%	-11.8%	11.0%	17.9%	8.4%	3.1%
8	548 W. Palm Beach, FL	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-3.9%	15.1%	17.9%	11.5%	13.2%
8	573 N.FL/S.GA VHS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	10.3%	10.2%	10.7%	9.8%	13.8%
8	573A Gainesville, FL	***	13.8%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>
8	573B Lake City, FL	***	9.4%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>
8	673 Tampa, FL	-4.8%	10.0%	4.8%	11.5%	28.4%	30.1%	14.2%
9	596 Lexington, KY	<b>-13.3%</b>	<b>-22.8%</b>	-6.5%	<b>-18.4%</b>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
9	614 Memphis, TN	***	-12.8%	0.2%	-11.6%	2.4%	15.8%	<b>-28.6%</b>
9	621 Mt. Home, TN	-5.0%	<b>-25.1%</b>	<b>-11.0%</b>	<b>-11.3%</b>	-8.0%	-4.0%	<b>-12.3%</b>
9	622 Murfreesboro, TN	-6.6%	-11.5%	-5.2%	<b>-12.5%</b>	-9.3%	-9.6%	<b>-18.4%</b>
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	-5.9%	9.4%	-2.2%	7.7%	7.9%	23.5%	13.2%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	40.8%	29.0%	0.0%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	-0.4%	-2.3%	10.3%	-2.6%	-3.4%	<b>-13.6%</b>	<b>-25.2%</b>
10	552 Dayton, OH	6.9%	***	10.3%	-6.9%	-9.0%	-16.5%	-9.1%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	-11.2%	-15.0%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	-7.3%	-4.6%	-0.2%	-4.8%	-4.9%	<b>-16.1%</b>	-7.2%
11	550 Danville, IL	<b>-26.9%</b>	***	8.3%	-18.4%	-9.0%	<b>-25.2%</b>	12.2%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	<i>n.a.</i>	14.6%	-17.0%	-5.4%	-3.6%	6.2%	-0.7%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	<b>-16.4%</b>	***	13.6%	22.4%	14.6%	21.7%	5.8%
12	578 Hines, IL	2.8%	<b>-28.3%</b>	4.0%	5.0%	0.2%	<b>-11.1%</b>	-8.8%
12	585 Iron Mountain, MI	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
12	607 Madison, WI	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	3.9%
12	676 Tomah, WI	-10.0%	<b>-23.8%</b>	1.6%	<b>-23.1%</b>	-7.6%	-6.0%	9.2%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	12.0%	<b>-17.7%</b>	-6.3%	-3.4%	-5.0%	<b>-14.5%</b>	<b>-20.9%</b>
15	543 Columbia, MO	***	***	-7.9%	***	***	***	***
15	589 Kansas City, KS	<b>-19.1%</b>	-9.8%	-7.2%	-7.3%	***	***	-7.0%
15	647 Poplar Bluff, MO	***	0.0%	***	***	***	***	***
15	657 St. Louis, MO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***
15	677 Topeka, KS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	-16.9%	-16.0%	4.6
15	677A4 Leavenworth, KS	<b>-22.2%</b>	-6.3%	-6.8%	-12.9%	5.0%	7.5%	0.5%
16	520 Biloxi, MI	<b>-20.2%</b>	-9.2%	7.6%	-4.7%	4.5%	1.7%	-3.1%
16	580 Houston, TX	5.6%	16.2%	3.5%	11.1%	8.0%	-4.1%	-8.3%
16	586 Jackson, MS	***	-20.4%	-11.3%	-8.4%	-4.8%	<b>-37.2%</b>	10.9%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	-19.5%	-5.0%	2.1%	0.0%	6.0%	0.2%	2.2%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	-18.1%	<b>-27.2%</b>	***	<b>-30.8%</b>	-13.3%	-12.1%	-0.1%
17	549 Dallas, TX	<b>-21.1%</b>	<b>-21.7%</b>	<b>-25.5%</b>	<b>-17.1%</b>	<b>-19.4%</b>	<b>-27.6%</b>	<b>-25.1%</b>
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	<i>n.a.</i>	-1.1%	2.1%	-9.0%	7.1%	0.9%	-15.0%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-10.7%	-9.8%	<b>-12.5%</b>
17	671 San Antonio, TX	-1.9%	-17.0%	14.3%	-3.8%	-14.7%	-8.9%	-6.6%
17	674 Temple, TX	-9.1%	<b>-30.2%</b>	<b>-24.8%</b>	<b>-20.0%</b>	27.4%	5.6%	-9.0%
17	674A4 Waco, TX	4.3%	<b>-18.8%</b>	***	***	-13.7%	***	<i>program closed</i>

Table 37f cont. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY02 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY03 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-4.7%	-12.6%	-9.2%
18	644 Phoenix, AZ	<i>n.a.</i>	***	5.2%	21.7%	14.7%	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
18	649 Prescott, AZ	-8.6%	-12.9%	5.9%	-2.0%	-1.1%	-4.6%	8.1%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	-8.5%	<b>-29.7%</b>	-0.6%	9.6%	-7.5%	-5.4%	<b>-19.1%</b>
18	756 El Paso	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE Col. Springs, CO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	4.8%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	14.1%	18.4%	13.9%	30.2%	7.7%	-2.5%	14.8%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	<i>n.a.</i>	-12.0%	-26.8%	5.8%	***	***	-17.2%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	-13.8%	-10.2%	-13.5%	20.2%	-4.3%	-7.7%	0.3%
20	648 Portland, OR	-10.5%	<b>-25.7%</b>	-0.5%	2.7%	-6.6%	-11.3%	-7.3%
20	653 Roseburg, OR	-3.2%	<b>-34.5%</b>	-5.4%	-10.7%	<b>-29.4%</b>	***	-11.3%
20	663 Seattle, WA	17.8%	<b>-36.0%</b>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
20	663A4 Am. Lake, WA	0.9%	-9.3%	8.3%	11.7%	-7.3%	7.3%	-19.8%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	14.7%	-2.8%
20	692 White City, OR	11.1%	0.7%	5.5%	1.5%	5.2%	9.6%	14.3%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	18.6%	1.9%	17.6%	1.2%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	***	<b>-17.7%</b>	3.6%	2.7%	15.0%	-1.0%	-3.1%
21	654 Reno, NV	***	***	***	-15.0%	-9.6%	***	<b>-33.0%</b>
21	662 San Francisco, CA	6.1%	-1.7%	-1.6%	-3.7%	<b>-19.4%</b>	<b>-16.6%</b>	-9.5%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	-7.9%	5.2%	22.5%	0.6%	28.8%	-0.8%	7.4%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	24.1%	8.5%	-4.7%	<b>-13.2%</b>	6.9%	12.4%	5.5%
22	664 San Diego, CA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-6.3%	16.4%	16.0%	2.4%	-11.2%
22	691 West LA, CA	***	***	<b>-25.5%</b>	16.4%	***	6.2%	-0.2%
22	691A4 Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437 Fargo, ND	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***
23	438 Sioux Falls, SD	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-9.4%	-6.3%	***
23	568 Fort Meade, SD	-12.7%	<b>-30.7%</b>	4.7%	12.4%	6.9%	-9.7%	-1.4%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	-4.4%	-12.1%	-11.0%	-7.6%	1.7%	-7.2%	4.5%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	21.6%	20.2%	6.8%	17.5%
23	636A6 Des Moines, IA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	5.7%	13.5%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	<b>-18.7%</b>	0.9%	5.3%	6.6%	21.5%	5.6%	3.3%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	-1.8%	-5.2%	6.5%	-5.6%	-9.4%	-8.3%	-8.1%

† Improvement in competitive employment situation has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

\*\*\* Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

**Table 37g. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

			FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
			Unemployed at Discharge	Unemployed at Discharge	Unemployed at Discharge	Unemployed at Discharge	Unemployed at Discharge	Unemployed at Discharge	Unemployed at Discharge
VISN	SITE		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	405	White River Jct., VT	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	***	***	-21.7%
1	518	Bedford, MA	-8.9%	0.6%	6.9%	<b>16.3%</b>	9.3%	<b>15.8%</b>	<b>23.0%</b>
1	523	Boston, MA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>23.8%</b>	-5.3%	-0.9%	8.2%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	7.6%	-10.4%	-2.8%	2.9%	4.5%	<b>13.3%</b>	-0.2%
1	608	Manchester, NH	11.1%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
1	631	Northampton, MA	2.8%	9.2%	-1.8%	-2.0%	-5.7%	0.0%	3.5%
1	650	Providence, RI	-5.7%	-6.9%	-10.7%	-7.0%	1.1%	<b>16.2%</b>	-6.2%
1	689	West Haven, CT	-13.5%	0.5%	-4.6%	-7.1%	-9.7%	3.3%	9.7%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	<b>31.7%</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>25.2%</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	8.5%	<b>15.1%</b>	-2.9%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	-18.1%	7.3%	0.0%	-16.3%	-17.4%	-19.3%	-10.7%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	<b>17.4%</b>	15.2%	-8.5%	-3.4%	-17.6%	-22.3%	3.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	6.8%	10.9%	11.4%	-4.8%	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>16.8%</b>	0.8%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	13.1%	-3.5%	-15.3%	-10.0%	-15.6%	-15.3%	0.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	<b>43.6%</b>	0.0%	<b>17.6%</b>	<b>23.5%</b>	9.8%	8.5%	<b>12.0%</b>
3	561	New Jersey HCS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	-3.5%	-1.4%	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	<b>26.7%</b>	-6.8%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	-25.5%	-13.6%	-3.0%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	0.9%	-10.3%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	-17.0%	-20.6%	-21.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	7.1%	0.8%	8.0%	0.0%	-2.2%	-2.1%	1.2%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	<i>n.a.</i>	8.8%	5.3%	<b>21.5%</b>	9.2%	-3.9%	4.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	<b>26.2%</b>	1.9%	9.1%	***	7.8%	2.9%	-9.2%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>36.6%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	13.4%	-2.2%	13.7%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	-3.3%	0.4%	8.0%	-13.9%	-20.0%	-19.2%	-5.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>21.5%</b>	14.0%	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>25.4%</b>
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	<b>30.3%</b>	2.6%	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	-15.6%	<i>program closed</i>
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	0.0%	-2.2%	-6.3%	0.9%	-10.6%	-15.8%	-1.1%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-13.1%	-7.3%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>23.8%</b>	16.6%	14.4%	-19.2%	-25.0%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-15.0%	15.9%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	-4.9%	15.7%	11.0%	***	8.5%	<b>21.0%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-14.7%	-0.6%	-12.4%	-14.9%	-0.6%
5	688	Washington DC	0.5%	<b>39.4%</b>	12.4%	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>15.2%</b>	10.1%
6	558	Durham, NC	-13.9%	-16.2%	-13.0%	-18.4%	-15.9%	***	<i>program closed</i>
6	590	Hampton, VA	-9.4%	<b>16.9%</b>	-3.2%	<b>12.8%</b>	-6.7%	7.8%	0.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-13.2%	-14.0%	-14.7%
6	652	Richmond, VA	<b>41.6%</b>	4.2%	<b>32.4%</b>	<i>program closed</i>	***	<b>46.4%</b>	<b>45.4%</b>
6	658	Salem, VA	14.8%	-0.8%	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>38.4%</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>21.2%</b>	<b>22.1%</b>
6	659	Salisbury, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-17.6%	-15.9%	-8.5%	-18.5%	-10.0%	-4.0%	-8.9%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-18.9%	-3.4%	-2.3%	-6.3%	-1.5%	11.1%	3.9%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-12.1%	-13.7%	-22.9%	-18.1%	-9.4%
7	534	Charleston, SC	-4.3%	-14.5%	-11.4%	-19.7%	-18.1%	-15.7%	-19.6%
7	544	Columbia, SC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	8.3%	<b>28.4%</b>
7	557	Dublin, GA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-12.1%	***	18.2%	<b>21.4%</b>
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>26.6%</b>	8.9%	-3.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	0.4%	9.1%	6.0%	<b>16.0%</b>	4.6%	-2.1%	-19.3%

**Table 37g cont. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

VISN		SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY02 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY03 Unemployed at Discharge %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	2.3%	-6.4%	-6.6%	<b>11.0%</b>	-9.1%	-21.8%	-7.6%
8	546	Miami, FL	-7.1%	-13.3%	-9.6%	-8.2%	-12.8%	-17.5%	-5.9%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-7.3%	4.4%	-26.4%	-1.3%	-20.1%
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	-8.8%	-14.3%	-23.8%	-14.4%	-23.8%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	-2.9%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	-2.6%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>
8	673	Tampa, FL	10.5%	-18.2%	-19.6%	-9.5%	-20.0%	-15.6%	5.8%
9	596	Lexington, KY	-6.3%	7.0%	3.9%	11.6%	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	<b>25.0%</b>	-1.6%	4.6%	-7.7%	-18.7%	4.9%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-1.8%	<b>15.3%</b>	6.0%	8.7%	4.2%	8.2%	3.1%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	1.9%	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	13.4%	8.1%	<b>13.9%</b>
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	-1.4%	-12.7%	2.4%	2.9%	6.6%	-19.0%	-15.3%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-21.4%	-20.5%	-3.4%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	<b>22.7%</b>	7.5%	0.7%	<b>25.6%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>18.1%</b>	2.1%
10	552	Dayton, OH	-14.1%	***	0.2%	-1.1%	-5.6%	-7.0%	-7.2%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	<b>23.1%</b>	22.9%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	<b>11.5%</b>	11.7%	12.2%	11.6%	11.9%	-1.6%	-11.8%
11	550	Danville, IL	<b>16.8%</b>	***	-18.4%	<b>19.1%</b>	-5.6%	<b>20.2%</b>	-11.3%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	<i>n.a.</i>	-4.1%	1.0%	9.4%	7.6%	9.6%	-9.2%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	-5.2%	***	9.2%	5.0%	5.3%	-0.2%	<b>12.7%</b>
12	578	Hines, IL	-17.6%	7.8%	-0.9%	5.8%	-4.3%	-2.6%	-0.6%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
12	607	Madison, WI	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	18.1%
12	676	Tomah, WI	<b>16.7%</b>	7.5%	-2.3%	<b>28.1%</b>	12.3%	7.5%	10.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	7.9%	4.7%	3.4%	2.0%	8.3%	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>19.3%</b>
15	543	Columbia, MO	***	***	18.2%	***	***	***	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-0.5%	<b>20.3%</b>	<b>32.1%</b>	<b>23.5%</b>	***	***	5.5%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-2.4%	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	19.0%	13.1%	<b>26.3%</b>
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	<b>19.9%</b>	0.1%	-9.0%	0.1%	-2.6%	-19.8%	1.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	<b>35.5%</b>	<b>15.8%</b>	10.4%	<b>28.1%</b>	<b>15.3%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>16.2%</b>
16	580	Houston, TX	-12.7%	-12.1%	-6.6%	-4.9%	-15.4%	2.1%	3.6%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	<b>30.6%</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	-4.0%	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>43.1%</b>	-2.7%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-3.1%	8.5%	9.9%	<b>12.6%</b>	10.7%	4.3%	9.7%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	<b>24.8%</b>	-10.0%	***	4.5%	-1.3%	-3.1%	2.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	6.2%	3.6%	6.9%	<b>20.1%</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>26.6%</b>	6.3%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	<i>n.a.</i>	-1.2%	-1.8%	3.4%	0.5%	-0.4%	2.6%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	-6.5%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	12.8%	11.4%	1.4%	13.3%	-19.3%	-16.6%	-10.4%
17	674	Temple, TX	-2.0%	<b>28.2%</b>	<b>37.3%</b>	2.3%	-24.8%	1.1%	<b>12.8%</b>
17	674A4	Waco, TX	6.3%	-2.9%	***	***	10.6%	***	<i>program closed</i>

Table 37g cont. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY02 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY03 Unemployed at Discharge %
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	20.6%	-5.3%	-13.6%
18	644 Phoenix, AZ	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-6.6%	-8.7%	-7.7%	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
18	649 Prescott, AZ	<b>22.8%</b>	<b>37.8%</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>22.0%</b>	<b>28.9%</b>	<b>23.5%</b>	<b>25.3%</b>
18	678 Tucson, AZ	-4.9%	3.8%	-3.2%	-3.9%	0.0%	3.2%	2.3%
18	756 El Paso	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE Col. Springs, CO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-15.3%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	-18.9%	-9.0%	-18.7%	-20.1%	-14.6%	-1.5%	-9.6%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	<i>n.a.</i>	-3.3%	21.1%	-20.7%	***	***	-25.8%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	<b>26.3%</b>	<b>21.0%</b>	-3.5%	-4.7%	-7.8%	-21.3%	-8.6%
20	648 Portland, OR	<b>18.8%</b>	<b>26.3%</b>	11.7%	-4.9%	8.3%	9.5%	7.3%
20	653 Roseburg, OR	11.0%	<b>28.0%</b>	<b>19.0%</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>52.9%</b>	***	-4.5%
20	663 Seattle, WA	-6.6%	21.0%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
20	663A4 Am. Lake, WA	<b>13.1%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	-0.9%	-0.5%	0.5%	-6.6%	<b>23.5%</b>
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-7.3%	-0.3%
20	692 White City, OR	-6.7%	3.0%	-3.7%	<b>11.6%</b>	-14.0%	-1.1%	-13.5%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	-12.9%	6.4%	-11.4%	-13.2%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	***	<b>30.4%</b>	2.9%	-3.1%	1.7%	11.2%	0.9%
21	654 Reno, NV	***	***	***	-11.2%	-6.2%	***	10.7%
21	662 San Francisco, CA	4.0%	6.7%	<b>14.2%</b>	1.6%	2.1%	7.8%	5.1%
22	600 Long Beach, CA	15.8%	-2.0%	-3.5%	4.7%	-7.9%	-14.2%	-11.5%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	-22.6%	-10.2%	-6.3%	-8.6%	-19.9%	-22.7%	-21.8%
22	664 San Diego, CA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-23.8%	-4.7%	-20.0%	-14.4%	-2.7%
22	691 West LA, CA	***	***	1.1%	-5.8%	***	-9.6%	1.3%
22	691A4 Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437 Fargo, ND	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***
23	438 Sioux Falls, SD	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	19.5%	26.0%	***
23	568 Fort Meade, SD	4.4%	0.4%	-16.6%	-7.8%	-12.9%	4.3%	-2.5%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	<b>17.4%</b>	10.2%	<b>18.8%</b>	12.5%	9.4%	9.7%	-0.9%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-5.7%	-26.0%	-10.5%	-8.5%
23	636A6 Des Moines, IA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-2.6%	-11.8%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	4.8%	-12.0%	-2.4%	-4.9%	-20.8%	-17.5%	-3.9%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	-0.5%	<b>10.4%</b>	0.9%	8.1%	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>31.1%</b>	<b>25.3%</b>

† Improvement in unemployment has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

\*\*\* Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

**Table 37h. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

			FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
			Employment Status Unknown at Discharge	Employment Status Unknown at Discharge	Employment Status Unknown at Discharge	Employment Status Unknown at Discharge	Employment Status Unknown at Discharge	Employment Status Unknown at Discharge	Employment Status Unknown at Discharge
VISN	SITE		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	405	White River Jct., VT	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	***	***	-1.6%
1	518	Bedford, MA	53.6%	42.8%	22.6%	14.4%	17.6%	12.6%	6.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-14.3%	-9.7%	-11.0%	-4.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	-2.7%	6.9%	5.8%	4.8%	10.0%	-5.4%	-6.5%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-6.1%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
1	631	Northampton, MA	4.5%	15.1%	13.3%	5.1%	1.7%	0.4%	4.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	13.8%	17.4%	6.1%	-2.8%	-3.7%	8.4%	4.6%
1	689	West Haven, CT	17.6%	10.6%	-7.3%	6.1%	0.0%	-3.2%	-5.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-11.1%	-5.4%	-7.5%	-8.9%	2.8%	-8.5%	4.6%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	28.2%	20.9%	8.0%	8.6%	0.9%	10.1%	-5.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	-14.7%	49.5%	-7.9%	-2.6%	-3.4%	-1.0%	1.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-8.2%	-0.6%	4.8%	-4.8%	-8.8%	-10.7%	-4.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	4.6%	12.4%	19.4%	7.6%	-2.0%	8.3%	2.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-5.8%	-9.7%	-10.9%	-13.2%	-12.0%	-10.2%	-7.1%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	0.1%	1.9%	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>	<i>see below</i>
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-15.1%	-2.3%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	-2.3%	-10.8%	5.9%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	-0.6%	0.0%	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	2.0%	-8.4%	-8.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	1.9%	11.8%	9.9%	8.9%	12.4%	3.5%	10.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	<i>n.a.</i>	-4.7%	-13.0%	-12.7%	4.3%	1.0%	6.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	-4.5%	19.4%	-10.6%	-15.2%	25.5%	14.6%	2.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	-5.1%	-13.2%	-13.9%	-11.6%	-10.8%	-8.8%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	0.9%	-8.1%	-11.4%	8.6%	18.8%	20.4%	15.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	-11.1%	-4.7%	-11.3%	-11.7%	-9.6%	-9.9%	-4.7%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	-10.2%	-13.9%	-14.0%	-12.5%	-10.5%	<i>program closed</i>
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-1.8%	10.8%	0.9%	6.9%	2.2%	3.4%	9.4%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-2.3%	5.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-10.0%	-6.7%	-13.0%	4.2%	-7.1%	-1.2%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-12.9%	-14.1%	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	-8.2%	13.7%	-10.8%	17.2%	-7.0%	0.0%	-4.6%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-5.6%	-10.5%	0.5%	-2.8%	0.0%
5	688	Washington DC	-8.3%	-9.4%	-13.1%	-13.4%	-12.2%	-9.8%	-8.9%
6	558	Durham, NC	-2.3%	3.2%	-3.1%	13.2%	7.4%	***	<i>program closed</i>
6	590	Hampton, VA	0.0%	-2.9%	-3.0%	-3.5%	-3.5%	-2.9%	-6.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	34.3%	9.2%	-5.3%	1.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	-11.4%	4.0%	-12.9%	<i>program closed</i>	***	-11.6%	-10.3%
6	658	Salem, VA	18.1%	5.0%	-12.7%	-12.8%	-10.0%	-1.3%	-8.0%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	28.5%	34.8%	22.4%	28.5%	18.0%	-1.3%	5.3%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-5.9%	19.4%	5.7%	0.2%	-6.0%	-8.1%	-0.2%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-8.8%	6.2%	8.7%	27.5%	2.5%
7	534	Charleston, SC	20.6%	17.5%	12.9%	-1.6%	4.3%	9.1%	7.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	1.5%	-8.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	1.1%	***	-11.0%	-2.9%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	21.7%	10.4%	1.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	2.7%	13.6%	8.2%	2.1%	-3.6%	7.2%	-1.8%

**Table 37h cont. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

VISN	SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY02 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY032 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	1.5%	18.7%	19.0%	-0.4%	16.9%	30.2%	5.2%
8	546 Miami, FL	-6.9%	24.1%	11.8%	2.7%	1.1%	10.4%	3.6%
8	548 W. Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	24.2%	-4.6%	-0.7%	0.0%	15.9%
8	573 N.FL/S.GA VHS	see below	see below	5.0%	9.3%	7.4%	9.4%	14.5%
8	573A Gainesville, FL	***	5.1%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573B Lake City, FL	***	-1.6%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	673 Tampa, FL	1.3%	11.4%	15.8%	3.1%	3.8%	-3.6%	-8.3%
9	596 Lexington, KY	14.9%	23.3%	11.9%	-0.6%	program closed	program closed	program closed
9	614 Memphis, TN	***	-1.6%	2.9%	5.6%	6.8%	2.1%	22.3%
9	621 Mt. Home, TN	12.5%	19.9%	19.1%	11.1%	10.5%	4.9%	16.5%
9	622 Murfreesboro, TN	12.8%	-0.4%	-8.8%	-9.6%	-10.6%	0.5%	6.5%
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	2.3%	-0.1%	-1.5%	-8.2%	-3.7%	-1.9%	0.6%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-10.5%	2.6%	6.0%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	-10.1%	5.7%	-0.8%	-7.6%	-9.4%	-2.4%	7.9%
10	552 Dayton, OH	15.6%	***	2.0%	-13.3%	1.5%	7.4%	-3.1%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	-5.8%	-7.4%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	1.0%	-2.4%	-6.1%	-11.9%	-10.6%	18.0%	1.9%
11	550 Danville, IL	21.8%	***	5.2%	17.6%	1.5%	-0.7%	-6.7%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	n.a.	-0.4%	2.4%	-0.8%	-9.0%	-8.7%	10.9%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	41.8%	***	-8.2%	-13.1%	-10.9%	-10.9%	-8.5%
12	578 Hines, IL	18.3%	28.0%	10.5%	-2.0%	12.2%	4.3%	4.9%
12	585 Iron Mountain, MI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	-8.6%
12	607 Madison, WI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	6.3%
12	676 Tomah, WI	-2.0%	0.6%	-3.1%	-7.3%	-11.8%	0.9%	4.5%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	-10.1%	4.3%	-5.9%	-2.9%	0.5%	4.1%	***
15	543 Columbia, MO	***	***	8.0%	***	***	***	***
15	589 Kansas City, KS	26.2%	-6.3%	-9.2%	0.0%	***	***	6.1%
15	647 Poplar Bluff, MO	***	36.8%	***	***	***	***	***
15	657 St. Louis, MO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***
15	677 Topeka, KS	see below	see below	see below	see below	5.5%	14.2%	-1.5%
15	677A4 Leavenworth, KS	11.7%	9.6%	22.8%	17.2%	9.3%	30.2%	8.1%
16	520 Biloxi, MI	-6.9%	2.4%	-2.1%	-5.1%	-8.0%	-6.9%	-0.9%
16	580 Houston, TX	2.6%	-2.2%	2.9%	-2.5%	3.2%	4.9%	8.4%
16	586 Jackson, MS	***	-4.5%	-4.3%	11.5%	-4.8%	13.4%	-3.1%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	17.1%	-3.8%	-5.4%	-11.7%	-10.2%	-1.9%	-2.3%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	-0.9%	48.3%	***	33.4%	23.0%	7.8%	8.0%
17	549 Dallas, TX	10.1%	15.4%	15.8%	5.2%	10.7%	5.5%	22.5%
17	549A4 Bonham, TX	n.a.	-1.1%	-6.8%	-5.5%	-7.0%	-1.9%	-0.1%
17	549BY Fort Worth, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-3.6%	-8.1%	15.8%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	-11.8%	4.6%	3.6%	-0.2%	14.5%	11.2%	16.9%
17	674 Temple, TX	13.5%	18.2%	0.0%	24.5%	9.4%	1.8%	4.2%
17	674A4 Waco, TX	-4.4%	16.5%	***	***	5.7%	***	program closed

**Table 37h cont. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††**

VISN	SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY02 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY03 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-12.4%	<b>13.4%</b>	<b>18.6%</b>
18	644 Phoenix, AZ	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-7.7%	-1.2%	-2.7%	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
18	649 Prescott, AZ	-7.5%	-4.0%	-10.2%	-0.6%	-9.4%	-6.8%	-7.5%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	14.1%	<b>27.3%</b>	8.3%	9.8%	5.6%	<b>14.7%</b>	<b>13.6%</b>
18	756 El Paso	<i>n.a.</i>	***	***	***	***	***	***
19	554GE Col. Springs, CO	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-7.9%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	9.6%	0.6%	-5.7%	8.6%	-5.4%	14.2%	-3.1%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	<i>n.a.</i>	8.3%	5.3%	<b>41.1%</b>	***	***	<b>53.0%</b>
20	463 Anchorage, AK	0.0%	2.1%	<b>34.9%</b>	-8.7%	<b>17.2%</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>14.4%</b>
20	648 Portland, OR	-3.4%	-8.4%	-6.1%	-4.2%	-4.9%	5.0%	2.5%
20	653 Roseburg, OR	-6.0%	0.9%	3.2%	6.3%	-10.4%	***	2.7%
20	663 Seattle, WA	5.6%	-9.3%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>	<i>program closed</i>
20	663A4 Am. Lake, WA	-11.7%	-1.2%	-2.8%	-7.4%	-5.9%	-6.0%	-2.3%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	15.3%	-0.7%
20	692 White City, OR	9.1%	3.3%	3.3%	-6.3%	<b>16.9%</b>	0.2%	0.1%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	-13.4%	-13.3%	-4.4%	-8.1%
21	640 Palo Alto, CA	***	-0.8%	3.4%	3.9%	-1.4%	2.9%	<b>10.7%</b>
21	654 Reno, NV	***	***	***	<b>22.4%</b>	-5.0%	***	-1.8%
21	662 San Francisco, CA	0.6%	-0.6%	1.6%	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>	<b>10.5%</b>
22	600 Long Beach, CA	0.5%	4.7%	-10.4%	4.3%	-7.4%	6.2%	2.0%
22	605 Loma Linda, CA	-5.4%	0.7%	2.0%	-1.7%	5.0%	-2.7%	0.7%
22	664 San Diego, CA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	-3.0%	0.7%	-7.7%	-4.7%	0.5%
22	691 West LA, CA	***	***	<b>45.3%</b>	5.0%	***	-5.9%	0.9%
22	691A4 Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
23	437 Fargo, ND	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	***
23	438 Sioux Falls, SD	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-0.4%	-11.6%	***
23	568 Fort Meade, SD	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>27.7%</b>	1.6%	-5.6%	-2.0%	-3.1%	-2.6%
23	568A4 Hot Springs, SD	-6.3%	-1.3%	-10.3%	-8.6%	-7.0%	-1.0%	-4.0%
23	618 Minneapolis, MN	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	-5.4%	13.4%	<b>15.2%</b>	9.0%
23	636A6 Des Moines, IA	<i>n.a.</i>	***	2.6%	-9.0%	***	***	<i>program closed</i>
23	636A7 Knoxville, IA	<b>22.3%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	-1.1%	5.7%	16.2%	6.8%	1.7%
23	656 St. Cloud, MN	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	4.5%	-0.6%	1.2%	-5.5%	-3.9%

† Improvement in employment unknown category has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

\*\*\* Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).



## **Appendix C: Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Data Tables**



## **List of Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Tables**

**Appendix C.1** Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans During FY 2003 by VISN

**Appendix C.2** CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by VISN

**Appendix C.3** Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by VISN

**Appendix C.4** Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by VISN

**Appendix C.5** Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Continuum of Care during FY 2003 by VISN

**Appendix C.6** Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site

**Appendix C.7** CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site

**Appendix C.8** Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site

**Appendix C.9** Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site

**Appendix C.10** Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Treatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2003 by Site



**Appendix C.1 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by VISN †**

<b>VISN</b>	<b># of Veterans Treated</b>	<b>Average # of PSR Stops</b>	<b>Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop</b>
1	2,498	51.68	141.42
2	1,839	26.50	97.68
3	2,276	53.29	114.68
4	1,149	37.51	85.17
5	1,447	31.21	86.62
6	1,233	37.56	91.60
7	2,341	28.24	91.51
8	2,505	22.28	62.17
9	1,049	9.74	70.81
10	4,000	27.38	85.78
11	1,515	35.32	77.93
12	1,981	52.46	114.36
15	1,588	33.99	92.15
16	3,142	28.14	79.48
17	1,482	45.98	94.46
18	1,816	19.57	69.29
19	539	17.76	64.88
20	1,538	19.12	74.65
21	758	22.81	90.03
22	2,241	33.75	104.16
23	2,276	35.96	88.46
<b>All VA</b>	<b>39,213</b>	<b>32.96</b>	<b>91.21</b>
<b>VISN Avg</b>	<b>1,867</b>	<b>31.92</b>	<b>89.39</b>
<b>VISN SD</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>11.61</b>	<b>18.10</b>

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 573 group IT, 535 individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance, 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT, 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

**Appendix C.2 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by VISN†**

<b>VISN</b>	<b># of Veterans Treated</b>	<b>Average # of CWT &amp;/or CWT/TR Stops</b>	<b>Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop</b>
1	2,025	51.41	162.40
2	950	26.19	120.94
3	1,741	44.28	134.14
4	719	36.96	103.32
5	781	32.44	89.15
6	351	43.89	103.80
7	1,418	24.15	122.22
8	632	44.94	121.40
9	324	15.74	116.39
10	3,351	23.90	108.86
11	925	24.06	101.00
12	1,285	51.64	131.07
15	648	19.84	102.52
16	1,042	32.16	96.99
17	1,110	55.00	117.83
18	1,288	20.92	123.07
19	235	20.59	109.87
20	509	27.10	90.68
21	665	20.25	139.64
22	1,469	36.32	145.45
23	1,380	37.00	107.07
<b>All VA</b>	<b>22,848</b>	<b>34.17</b>	<b>120.29</b>
<b>VISN Avg</b>	<b>1088</b>	<b>32.80</b>	<b>116.56</b>
<b>VISN SD</b>	<b>686</b>	<b>11.67</b>	<b>18.10</b>

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 - individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation and 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT.

**Appendix C.3 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by VISN †**

<b>VISN</b>	<b># of Veterans Treated</b>	<b>Average # of IT Stops</b>	<b>Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop</b>
1	409	44.97	163.77
2	704	16.73	121.09
3	481	53.90	121.72
4	266	37.22	81.25
5	431	34.30	137.46
6	448	50.36	138.16
7	639	37.61	123.33
8	320	49.65	115.39
9	585	6.76	88.71
10	1044	25.20	118.55
11	308	86.29	132.12
12	610	50.59	118.39
15	580	65.66	125.10
16	1010	26.74	69.58
17	206	25.52	80.41
18	212	20.75	100.12
19	60	61.95	148.53
20	314	13.38	113.33
21	50	72.00	137.18
22	225	32.49	128.13
23	585	42.08	114.16
<b>All VA</b>	<b>9,487</b>	<b>36.80</b>	<b>113.38</b>
<b>VISN Avg</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>40.67</b>	<b>117.93</b>
<b>VISN SD</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>19.84</b>	<b>22.80</b>

† Includes stop code 573 - group IT and 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT.

**Appendix C.4 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by VISN †**

<b>VISN</b>	<b># of Veterans Treated</b>	<b>Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops</b>	<b>Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop</b>
1	662	9.97	128.02
2	1,497	8.06	95.13
3	1,285	14.22	83.67
4	709	9.34	70.78
5	1,032	4.88	91.67
6	1,032	8.09	85.67
7	1,328	5.90	101.91
8	2,100	5.48	83.56
9	359	3.25	82.15
10	704	4.48	52.42
11	872	5.36	108.39
12	1,226	5.46	94.23
15	823	3.70	78.18
16	2,622	10.64	95.77
17	466	3.94	54.37
18	1,004	4.19	75.78
19	340	2.98	123.16
20	1,171	9.74	95.78
21	105	2.13	96.07
22	1,445	10.37	108.44
23	1,231	5.01	75.22
<b>All VA</b>	<b>22,013</b>	<b>7.39</b>	<b>90.22</b>
<b>VISN Avg</b>	<b>1048</b>	<b>6.53</b>	<b>89.54</b>
<b>VISN SD</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>18.63</b>

† Includes stop codes 535 - individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational assistance and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

**Appendix C.5 Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services  
Continuum of Care during FY 2003 by VISN**

<b>VISN</b>	<b># of Veterans Treated</b>	<b>% Received CWT &amp;/or CWT/TR Services First</b>	<b>% Received IT Services First</b>	<b>% Received Vocational Assistance Services First</b>
1	2498	70.8%	12.1%	18.7%
2	1839	39.5%	16.3%	51.0%
3	2276	59.0%	9.6%	35.0%
4	1149	39.4%	10.9%	54.0%
5	1447	31.9%	17.8%	52.2%
6	1233	12.3%	21.3%	69.1%
7	2341	46.4%	17.0%	38.8%
8	2505	15.3%	8.5%	76.9%
9	1049	17.9%	50.7%	32.0%
10	4000	81.2%	14.9%	4.3%
11	1515	52.9%	4.6%	45.1%
12	1981	46.0%	24.5%	42.6%
15	1588	36.8%	23.0%	40.7%
16	3142	16.8%	14.7%	71.1%
17	1482	66.3%	9.0%	25.1%
18	1816	61.2%	2.5%	37.5%
19	539	39.3%	4.8%	56.2%
20	1538	17.0%	13.4%	70.5%
21	758	84.6%	6.2%	9.8%
22	2241	50.7%	6.6%	47.9%
23	2276	46.1%	13.7%	42.7%
<b>All VA</b>	<b>39,213</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>42.7%</b>
<b>VISN Avg</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>14.4%</b>	<b>43.9%</b>
<b>VISN SD</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>20.9%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>19.0%</b>

**Appendix C.6 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site †**

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	115	52.15	195.22
1	405	White River Junction, VT	76	18.12	85.16
1	518	Bedford, MA	867	65.20	151.28
1	523	Boston, MA	568	50.97	157.50
1	631	Northampton, MA	299	58.99	135.05
1	650	Providence, RI	226	43.32	121.98
1	689	West Haven, CT	347	25.39	103.07
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	1,839	26.50	97.68
3	526	Bronx, NY	318	55.98	95.08
3	561	E. Orange, NY	685	43.73	108.75
3	620	Montrose, NY	322	66.14	104.66
3	630	New York, NY	383	29.66	81.02
3	632	Northport, NY	568	71.96	161.18
4	529	Butler, PA	153	14.75	61.89
4	542	Coatesville, PA	234	47.42	79.20
4	595	Lebanon, PA	214	64.03	115.07
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	383	38.74	92.80
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	165	7.29	58.75
5	512	Baltimore, MD	665	39.50	95.62
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	462	8.18	67.37
5	688	Washington DC	320	47.22	95.73
6	558	Durham, NC	172	36.41	74.49
6	590	Hampton, VA	618	32.52	83.18
6	652	Richmond, VA	78	10.42	80.56
6	658	Salem, VA	148	74.94	133.47
6	659	Salisbury, NC	217	37.07	104.56
7	508	Atlanta, GA	299	29.80	97.05
7	509	Augusta, GA	512	33.40	98.13
7	521	Birmingham, AL	137	7.61	156.27
7	534	Charleston, SC	129	7.85	69.82
7	544	Columbia, SC	282	22.36	71.00
7	557	Dublin, GA	178	39.20	70.83
7	619	Montgomery, AL	357	28.73	108.03
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	447	32.43	74.62
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	328	67.09	117.70
8	546	Miami, FL	286	28.22	74.79
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	308	16.07	42.31
8	573	Gainesville, FL	607	13.87	70.23
8	673	Tampa, FL	976	12.66	41.07
9	614	Memphis, TN	381	14.07	34.40
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	572	6.95	90.41
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	96	9.19	98.48

**Appendix C.6 cont. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003  
by Site †**

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	1,007	26.08	88.67
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	533	27.20	71.74
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,803	26.69	83.47
10	552	Dayton, OH	643	32.0	100.8
10	757	Columbus, OH	14	2.6	18.3
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	77	42.4	90.9
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	679	40.16	70.67
11	550	Danville, IL	167	52.17	127.46
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	347	39.22	102.60
11	610	Marion, IL	245	2.64	25.26
12	556	North Chicago, IL	505	44.30	94.71
12	578	Hines, IL	768	40.67	103.31
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	90	8.42	18.76
12	607	Madison, WI	161	21.29	85.70
12	676	Tomah, WI	165	86.76	171.08
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	292	108.91	190.62
15	589	Kansas City, MO	1,454	35.35	96.86
15	657	St. Louis, MO	134	19.22	41.08
16	502	Alexandria, LA	274	7.86	57.12
16	520	Biloxi, MS	355	43.79	96.14
16	580	Houston, TX	713	40.00	95.42
16	586	Jackson, MS	161	7.98	68.43
16	598	Little Rock, AR	1,306	26.73	73.36
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	159	14.45	73.45
16	667	Shreveport, LA	174	21.24	77.14
17	549	Dallas, TX	930	56.94	112.66
17	671	San Antonio, TX	370	27.58	63.59
17	674	Temple, TX	182	27.38	64.22
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	587	32.84	110.65
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	433	1.50	9.77
18	649	Prescott, AZ	586	11.90	68.11
18	678	Tucson, AZ	198	40.64	79.18
18	756	El Paso, TX	12	49.83	87.50
19	554	Denver, Co	190	4.21	47.40
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	344	25.48	75.47
19	666	Sheridan, WY	5	1.00	0.00
20	463	Anchorage, AK	66	47.56	96.74
20	648	Portland, OR	510	20.05	67.12
20	653	Roseburg, OR	99	13.12	120.88
20	663	Seattle, WA	477	10.63	73.78
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	125	21.04	88.94
20	692	White City, OR	261	26.97	60.98
21	459	Honolulu, HI	95	43.38	111.98
21	612	Martinez, CA	222	5.26	56.60
21	640	Palo Alto	195	25.15	106.23
21	662	San Francisco, CA	246	28.86	98.89

**Appendix C.6 cont. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003  
by Site †**

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	21	4.33	13.62
22	600	Long Beach, CA	1,076	20.69	90.89
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	270	52.01	116.76
22	664	San Diego, CA	180	8.55	93.23
22	691	West LA, CA	694	54.33	125.40
23	437	Fargo, ND	102	2.83	13.25
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	719	45.45	108.42
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	135	2.07	35.47
23	636	Des Moines, IA	565	34.80	88.35
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	755	38.33	89.17
<b>All VA</b>			<b>39,213</b>	<b>32.96</b>	<b>91.21</b>
<b>Site Avg</b>			<b>400</b>	<b>31.01</b>	<b>87.28</b>
<b>Site SD</b>			<b>349</b>	<b>20.65</b>	<b>36.18</b>

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 573 group IT, 535 individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance, 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT, 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

**Appendix C.7 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site †**

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	19	12.89	86.00
1	405	White River Junction, VT	76	18.12	109.69
1	518	Bedford, MA	820	60.40	170.13
1	523	Boston, MA	465	52.77	197.47
1	631	Northampton, MA	236	53.82	138.12
1	650	Providence, RI	225	42.02	161.44
1	689	West Haven, CT	184	34.05	100.86
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	950	26.19	120.94
3	526	Bronx, NY	287	54.45	122.47
3	561	E. Orange, NY	455	32.80	123.94
3	620	Montrose, NY	250	36.98	108.29
3	630	New York, NY	383	28.45	151.88
3	632	Northport, NY	366	72.16	158.80
4	529	Butler, PA	52	22.42	58.53
4	542	Coatesville, PA	174	34.48	86.08
4	595	Lebanon, PA	174	42.60	120.43
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	263	43.90	100.84
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	56	8.09	143.21
5	512	Baltimore, MD	260	32.56	67.83
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	293	9.03	70.86
5	688	Washington DC	228	62.39	137.08
6	558	Durham, NC	1	22.00	30.00
6	590	Hampton, VA	197	38.71	103.58
6	652	Richmond, VA	24	8.25	131.89
6	658	Salem, VA	99	66.08	109.94
6	659	Salisbury, NC	30	33.93	66.63
7	508	Atlanta, GA	289	26.94	128.15
7	509	Augusta, GA	309	16.50	83.95
7	521	Birmingham, AL	137	7.20	201.52
7	534	Charleston, SC	87	7.26	91.52
7	544	Columbia, SC	129	44.64	155.07
7	557	Dublin, GA	43	56.23	92.67
7	619	Montgomery, AL	294	20.57	124.02
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	130	42.37	91.97
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	132	82.73	157.46
8	546	Miami, FL	185	20.37	115.99
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	66	64.98	99.20
8	573	Gainesville, FL	115	18.37	131.07
8	673	Tampa, FL	134	54.57	97.05
9	614	Memphis, TN	77	40.74	116.54
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	154	10.53	120.07
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	93	3.68	109.68

**Appendix C.7 cont.CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site**

†

VISN	SITE	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	986	20.76	99.95
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	515	27.48	101.73
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,719	24.16	115.75
10	552	Dayton, OH	131	29.87	124.26
10	757	Columbus, OH	0		
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	68	42.10	110.00
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	668	11.47	89.39
11	550	Danville, IL	66	64.73	140.03
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	100	73.44	131.29
11	610	Marion, IL	23	4.87	28.17
12	556	North Chicago, IL	417	36.98	96.17
12	578	Hines, IL	411	62.92	152.51
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	90	8.17	22.21
12	607	Madison, WI	89	32.60	148.86
12	676	Tomah, WI	97	65.56	135.70
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	181	83.35	222.59
15	589	Kansas City, MO	612	18.84	105.06
15	657	St. Louis, MO	36	36.78	71.18
16	502	Alexandria, LA	1	22.00	37.00
16	520	Biloxi, MS	207	34.71	68.99
16	580	Houston, TX	297	46.48	120.48
16	586	Jackson, MS	161	7.86	106.23
16	598	Little Rock, AR	191	48.49	88.94
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	151	10.48	93.45
16	667	Shreveport, LA	34	11.41	95.48
17	549	Dallas, TX	794	65.49	128.76
17	671	San Antonio, TX	134	31.01	122.35
17	674	Temple, TX	182	26.91	65.16
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	404	35.41	172.03
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	209	1.40	13.81
18	649	Prescott, AZ	524	7.47	90.80
18	678	Tucson, AZ	139	56.36	135.54
18	756	El Paso, TX	12	49.83	262.50
19	554	Denver, Co	189	3.70	75.10
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	41	100.85	215.08
19	666	Sheridan, WY	5	1.00	
20	463	Anchorage, AK	38	58.34	147.90
20	648	Portland, OR	175	34.53	73.47
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	14.02	146.66
20	663	Seattle, WA	150	14.81	73.52
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	63	17.17	93.79
20	692	White City, OR	42	39.48	105.03
21	459	Honolulu, HI	33	80.06	199.28
21	612	Martinez, CA	222	5.26	98.94
21	640	Palo Alto	165	15.73	151.98
21	662	San Francisco, CA	245	28.83	152.42

**Appendix C.7 cont.CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site**

†

VISN	SITE	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	21	4.33	17.88
22	600	Long Beach, CA	581	11.92	106.87
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	249	53.93	136.50
22	664	San Diego, CA	37	9.95	173.74
22	691	West LA, CA	581	56.01	182.81
23	437	Fargo, ND	7	24.71	37.83
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	693	30.06	117.36
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	24	4.21	58.25
23	636	Des Moines, IA	151	66.03	136.48
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	505	39.58	87.18
<b>All VA</b>			<b>22,848</b>	<b>34.17</b>	<b>120.29</b>
<b>Site Avg</b>			<b>233</b>	<b>33.83</b>	<b>114.35</b>
<b>Site SD</b>			<b>261</b>	<b>22.34</b>	<b>44.67</b>

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 - individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation and 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT.

**Appendix C.8 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003  
by Site**

			# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
VISN		SITE			
1	402	Togus, ME	50	56.62	158.14
1	405	White River Junction, VT	0		
1	518	Bedford, MA	61	111.77	258.35
1	523	Boston, MA	148	29.65	188.74
1	631	Northampton, MA	55	67.40	136.52
1	650	Providence, RI	48	6.98	23.51
1	689	West Haven, CT	47	6.68	125.37
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	704	16.73	121.09
3	526	Bronx, NY	64	26.86	61.57
3	561	E. Orange, NY	75	71.83	166.61
3	620	Montrose, NY	173	32.27	62.22
3	630	New York, NY	10	28.50	67.14
3	632	Northport, NY	159	81.45	193.11
4	529	Butler, PA	2	21.00	41.50
4	542	Coatesville, PA	41	114.98	221.95
4	595	Lebanon, PA	126	24.87	41.78
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	96	20.36	74.03
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	1	55.00	77.00
5	512	Baltimore, MD	178	80.05	180.72
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	223	2.10	78.99
5	688	Washington DC	30	2.23	84.75
6	558	Durham, NC	48	126.25	220.84
6	590	Hampton, VA	249	26.01	96.83
6	652	Richmond, VA	1	10.00	11.00
6	658	Salem, VA	48	87.88	175.20
6	659	Salisbury, NC	102	56.81	140.48
7	508	Atlanta, GA	3	71.33	107.00
7	509	Augusta, GA	324	36.99	166.68
7	521	Birmingham, AL	2	16.00	51.00
7	534	Charleston, SC	0		
7	544	Columbia, SC	0		
7	557	Dublin, GA	150	24.09	47.97
7	619	Montgomery, AL	89	4.40	52.49
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	71	109.77	204.36
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	173	58.50	94.05
8	546	Miami, FL	102	23.89	132.36
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	1	14.00	56.00
8	573	Gainesville, FL	2	29.00	88.50
8	673	Tampa, FL	42	77.55	179.72
9	614	Memphis, TN	43	26.56	39.02
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	537	4.23	93.41
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	5	108.00	158.00

**Appendix C.8 cont. Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site**

			# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
VISN	SITE				
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	107	47.64	188.29
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	87	2.43	57.70
10	541	Cleveland, OH	282	19.23	101.30
10	552	Dayton, OH	568	27.42	119.82
10	757	Columbus, OH	0		
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	6	1.67	118.00
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	129	150.11	179.13
11	550	Danville, IL	76	37.88	113.32
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	96	44.93	82.82
11	610	Marion, IL	1	11.00	14.00
12	556	North Chicago, IL	388	15.90	64.48
12	578	Hines, IL	19	30.32	57.78
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	1	16.00	23.00
12	607	Madison, WI	1	1.00	
12	676	Tomah, WI	73	108.95	221.85
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	128	126.09	221.18
15	589	Kansas City, MO	471	78.19	138.74
15	657	St. Louis, MO	109	11.49	38.97
16	502	Alexandria, LA	61	25.67	47.83
16	520	Biloxi, MS	89	49.54	118.41
16	580	Houston, TX	384	18.99	62.28
16	586	Jackson, MS	2	5.00	9.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	434	30.11	72.72
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	9	31.56	56.75
16	667	Shreveport, LA	31	12.19	17.60
17	549	Dallas, TX	3	9.67	214.00
17	671	San Antonio, TX	197	26.28	80.85
17	674	Temple, TX	6	8.33	39.20
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	125	32.83	112.38
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	4	1.00	
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	3.51	69.18
18	678	Tucson, AZ	0		
18	756	El Paso, TX	0		
19	554	Denver, Co	4	24.25	41.67
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	56	64.64	154.36
19	666	Sheridan, WY	0		
20	463	Anchorage, AK	31	29.48	51.65
20	648	Portland, OR	53	28.70	75.62
20	653	Roseburg, OR	8	12.38	95.43
20	663	Seattle, WA	217	7.54	139.99
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	1	7.00	14.00
20	692	White City, OR	4	6.00	72.00
21	459	Honolulu, HI	18	71.72	191.65
21	612	Martinez, CA	0		
21	640	Palo Alto	32	72.16	108.25
21	662	San Francisco, CA	0		

**Appendix C.8 cont. Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site**

			# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
VISN		SITE			
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	0		
22	600	Long Beach, CA	75	23.91	84.01
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	0		
22	664	San Diego, CA	97	11.06	119.71
22	691	West LA, CA	53	83.85	218.23
23	437	Fargo, ND	0		
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	192	53.69	95.37
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	125	1.29	86.00
23	636	Des Moines, IA	97	74.90	170.25
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	171	40.25	107.97
<b>All VA</b>			<b>9,487</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>113.38</b>
<b>Site Avg</b>			<b>97</b>	<b>39.14</b>	<b>106.49</b>
<b>Site SD</b>			<b>134</b>	<b>35.12</b>	<b>61.08</b>

† Includes stop code 573 - group IT and 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT.

**Appendix C.9 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003 by Site**

VISN SITE			# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	67	43.60	263.24
1	405	White River Junction, VT	0		
1	518	Bedford, MA	71	2.63	81.32
1	523	Boston, MA	14	1.79	25.50
1	631	Northampton, MA	222	5.55	113.61
1	650	Providence, RI	0		
1	689	West Haven, CT	288	7.75	111.26
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	1,497	8.06	95.13
3	526	Bronx, NY	170	2.69	64.59
3	561	E. Orange, NY	490	19.69	76.97
3	620	Montrose, NY	272	23.79	81.51
3	630	New York, NY	17	10.53	43.77
3	632	Northport, NY	336	4.50	108.97
4	529	Butler, PA	134	7.83	62.83
4	542	Coatesville, PA	104	3.67	65.47
4	595	Lebanon, PA	173	18.24	105.92
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	170	7.88	43.78
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	128	5.43	66.13
5	512	Baltimore, MD	623	5.70	84.84
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	143	4.64	81.69
5	688	Washington DC	266	3.08	121.24
6	558	Durham, NC	134	1.34	98.38
6	590	Hampton, VA	580	10.34	86.84
6	652	Richmond, VA	74	8.18	119.48
6	658	Salem, VA	77	4.30	75.55
6	659	Salisbury, NC	167	7.38	70.92
7	508	Atlanta, GA	161	5.65	118.60
7	509	Augusta, GA	4	3.25	10.67
7	521	Birmingham, AL	5	4.60	110.67
7	534	Charleston, SC	101	3.77	92.61
7	544	Columbia, SC	194	2.81	99.58
7	557	Dublin, GA	170	5.56	77.95
7	619	Montgomery, AL	288	13.25	131.47
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	405	2.95	75.18
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	231	4.18	95.10
8	546	Miami, FL	81	23.01	107.81
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	304	2.13	78.16
8	573	Gainesville, FL	571	10.95	118.57
8	673	Tampa, FL	913	1.95	52.11
9	614	Memphis, TN	350	3.09	82.76
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	9	9.33	70.20
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	0		

**Appendix C.9 cont. Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003  
by Site**

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	168	4.14	60.24
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	86	1.56	45.59
10	541	Cleveland, OH	293	4.00	40.25
10	552	Dayton, OH	143	7.83	71.83
10	757	Columbus, OH	14	2.64	36.57
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	61	6.46	83.23
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	86	2.81	79.60
11	550	Danville, IL	163	9.58	159.24
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	335	5.83	116.46
11	610	Marion, IL	227	2.31	55.17
12	556	North Chicago, IL	304	2.58	47.88
12	578	Hines, IL	671	7.15	108.94
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	1	7.00	35.00
12	607	Madison, WI	110	4.77	60.11
12	676	Tomah, WI	2	2.00	92.00
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	138	4.18	165.86
15	589	Kansas City, MO	823	3.70	78.18
15	657	St. Louis, MO	0		
16	502	Alexandria, LA	245	2.31	139.59
16	520	Biloxi, MS	348	11.36	99.32
16	580	Houston, TX	695	10.68	115.99
16	586	Jackson, MS	3	3.33	46.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	1,115	11.28	76.68
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	72	5.97	96.32
16	667	Shreveport, LA	144	20.34	95.32
17	549	Dallas, TX	210	4.42	43.42
17	671	San Antonio, TX	246	3.54	66.94
17	674	Temple, TX	10	3.60	25.71
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	358	2.42	119.59
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	248	1.42	58.79
18	649	Prescott, AZ	336	8.24	58.48
18	678	Tucson, AZ	62	3.42	26.96
18	756	El Paso, TX	0		
19	554	Denver, Co	1	4.00	8.00
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	339	2.98	123.85
19	666	Sheridan, WY	0		
20	463	Anchorage, AK	7	1.14	35.00
20	648	Portland, OR	490	5.43	88.85
20	653	Roseburg, OR	85	7.35	165.96
20	663	Seattle, WA	260	4.67	92.10
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	96	16.05	106.38
20	692	White City, OR	233	23.00	82.41
21	459	Honolulu, HI	76	2.47	104.94
21	612	Martinez, CA	0		
21	640	Palo Alto	0		
21	662	San Francisco, CA	29	1.24	32.20

**Appendix C.9 cont. Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2003  
by Site**

			# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
VISN		SITE			
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	0		
22	600	Long Beach, CA	925	14.64	110.87
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	156	3.95	124.44
22	664	San Diego, CA	77	1.27	82.80
22	691	West LA, CA	287	2.51	73.18
23	437	Fargo, ND	97	1.20	87.58
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	41	37.49	77.58
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	4	4.25	32.50
23	636	Des Moines, IA	458	5.29	63.13
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	631	3.28	83.82
<b>All VA</b>			<b>22,013</b>	<b>7.39</b>	<b>90.22</b>
<b>Site Avg</b>			<b>225</b>	<b>7.06</b>	<b>83.72</b>
<b>Site SD</b>			<b>261</b>	<b>7.23</b>	<b>37.94</b>

† Includes stop codes 535 - individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

**Appendix C.10 Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Treatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2003 by Site**

VISN	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
1	402 Togus, ME	115	10.4%	36.5%	55.7%
1	405 White River Junction, VT	76	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518 Bedford, MA	867	91.5%	6.1%	2.8%
1	523 Boston, MA	568	76.2%	23.1%	0.9%
1	631 Northampton, MA	299	47.5%	10.7%	50.5%
1	650 Providence, RI	226	97.8%	2.2%	0.0%
1	689 West Haven, CT	347	26.5%	11.5%	64.6%
2	528 Upstate NY HCS	1,839	39.5%	16.3%	51.0%
3	526 Bronx, NY	318	68.6%	7.5%	24.5%
3	561 E. Orange, NY	685	45.8%	6.1%	52.0%
3	620 Montrose, NY	322	38.2%	15.5%	59.6%
3	630 New York, NY	383	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	632 Northport, NY	568	53.7%	18.0%	29.9%
4	529 Butler, PA	153	15.7%	0.0%	84.3%
4	542 Coatesville, PA	234	59.0%	13.7%	30.3%
4	595 Lebanon, PA	214	34.1%	18.7%	66.8%
4	646 Pittsburgh, PA	383	44.6%	13.8%	41.5%
4	693 Wilkes Barre, PA	165	28.5%	0.0%	71.5%
5	512 Baltimore, MD	665	6.9%	12.0%	82.0%
5	613 Martinsburg, WV	462	49.6%	35.9%	15.6%
5	688 Washington DC	320	58.4%	3.8%	43.4%
6	558 Durham, NC	172	0.0%	25.6%	74.4%
6	590 Hampton, VA	618	9.5%	19.9%	75.4%
6	652 Richmond, VA	78	11.5%	0.0%	88.5%
6	658 Salem, VA	148	56.8%	27.0%	18.9%
6	659 Salisbury, NC	217	0.0%	25.8%	74.2%
7	508 Atlanta, GA	299	91.3%	0.0%	11.4%
7	509 Augusta, GA	512	51.4%	48.8%	0.0%
7	521 Birmingham, AL	137	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534 Charleston, SC	129	48.1%	0.0%	51.9%
7	544 Columbia, SC	282	42.9%	0.0%	57.4%
7	557 Dublin, GA	178	8.4%	44.9%	58.4%
7	619 Montgomery, AL	357	49.3%	5.0%	51.0%
7	679 Tuscaloosa, AL	447	8.7%	11.2%	80.5%
8	516 Bay Pines, FL	328	25.0%	27.7%	47.6%
8	546 Miami, FL	286	60.1%	32.9%	11.5%
8	548 West Palm Beach, FL	308	6.5%	0.0%	93.8%
8	573 Gainesville, FL	607	8.2%	0.0%	91.8%
8	673 Tampa, FL	976	6.0%	2.8%	91.3%
9	614 Memphis, TN	381	11.8%	0.8%	88.2%
9	621 Mountain Home, TN	572	8.9%	91.8%	0.0%
9	626 Murfreesboro, TN	96	95.8%	4.2%	0.0%

**Appendix C.10 cont. Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Treatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2003 by Site**

VISN	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
10	538 Chillicothe, OH	1,007	95.9%	2.7%	1.9%
10	539 Cincinnati, OH	533	93.4%	1.9%	4.7%
10	541 Cleveland, OH	1,803	94.6%	2.1%	3.5%
10	552 Dayton, OH	643	12.0%	81.3%	7.6%
10	757 Columbus, OH	14	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
11	506 Ann Arbor, MI	77	70.1%	0.0%	29.9%
11	515 Battle Creek, MI	679	96.5%	4.4%	2.4%
11	550 Danville, IL	167	17.4%	10.2%	77.8%
11	583 Indianapolis, IN	347	12.7%	6.6%	83.0%
11	610 Marion, IL	245	7.8%	0.0%	92.2%
12	556 North Chicago, IL	505	40.6%	65.3%	41.0%
12	578 Hines, IL	768	40.1%	0.0%	61.5%
12	585 Iron Mountain, MI	90	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	607 Madison, WI	161	38.5%	0.0%	61.5%
12	676 Tomah, WI	165	58.8%	41.2%	0.0%
12	695 Milwaukee, WI	292	51.0%	30.1%	22.3%
15	589 Kansas City, MO	1,454	38.4%	17.6%	44.5%
15	657 St. Louis, MO	134	18.7%	81.3%	0.0%
16	502 Alexandria, LA	274	0.0%	19.0%	82.1%
16	520 Biloxi, MS	355	20.3%	7.3%	75.8%
16	580 Houston, TX	713	10.1%	7.7%	88.1%
16	586 Jackson, MS	161	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598 Little Rock, AR	1,306	3.4%	25.1%	73.2%
16	635 Oklahoma City, OK	159	92.5%	0.0%	7.5%
16	667 Shreveport, LA	174	17.2%	0.6%	82.2%
17	549 Dallas, TX	930	79.5%	0.2%	20.3%
17	671 San Antonio, TX	370	16.5%	35.4%	49.5%
17	674 Temple, TX	182	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	501 Albuquerque, NM	587	54.9%	6.3%	40.0%
18	644 Phoenix, AZ	433	45.3%	0.0%	54.7%
18	649 Prescott, AZ	586	75.6%	1.5%	25.6%
18	678 Tucson, AZ	198	70.2%	0.0%	29.8%
18	756 El Paso, TX	12	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
19	554 Denver, Co	190	99.5%	0.5%	0.0%
19	660 Salt Lake City, UT	344	5.2%	7.3%	88.1%
19	666 Sheridan, WY	5	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463 Anchorage, AK	66	45.5%	47.0%	9.1%
20	648 Portland, OR	510	10.4%	2.2%	87.8%
20	653 Roseburg, OR	99	16.2%	1.0%	82.8%
20	663 Seattle, WA	477	17.0%	34.2%	50.7%
20	687 Walla Walla, WA	125	37.6%	0.0%	63.2%
20	692 White City, OR	261	13.0%	0.0%	87.0%
21	459 Honolulu, HI	95	15.8%	15.8%	70.5%
21	612 Martinez, CA	222	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640 Palo Alto	195	84.1%	16.4%	0.0%
21	662 San Francisco, CA	246	97.6%	0.0%	2.8%

**Appendix C.10 cont. Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Treatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2003 by Site**

			# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
VISN	SITE					
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	21	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	1,076	33.9%	1.9%	73.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	270	89.3%	0.0%	11.1%
22	664	San Diego, CA	180	7.8%	52.8%	39.4%
22	691	West LA, CA	694	71.5%	4.8%	26.8%
23	437	Fargo, ND	102	5.9%	0.0%	94.1%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	719	91.0%	8.8%	1.0%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	135	7.4%	92.6%	0.0%
23	636	Des Moines, IA	565	13.3%	13.5%	74.9%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	755	40.3%	6.2%	59.1%
<b>All VA</b>			<b>39,213</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>42.7%</b>
<b>Site Avg</b>			<b>400</b>	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>41.6%</b>
<b>Site SD</b>			<b>349</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>